DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 305 204 RC 017 017

AUTHOR Clewell, Beatriz Chu; Joy, Myra Ficklen
TITLE The National Hispanic Scholar Awards Program. A Descriptive Analysis of High-Achieving Hispanic Students.
INSTITUTION College Entrance Examination Board, New York, N.Y.
REPORT NO CEEB-88-10; ETS-RR-56
PUB DATE 88
NOTE 80p.
AVAILABLE FROM College Board Publications, Box 886, New York, NY 10101-0886 ($6.00).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160) -- Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Achievement; Achievement; *College Freshmen; Educational Attainment; *High Achievement; Higher Education; *Hispanic Americans; Mail Surveys; Mexican Americans; Minority Groups; Puerto Ricans; Questionnaires; Scholarships; *Success
IDENTIFIERS *National Hispanic Scholar Awards Program; Student Descriptive Questionnaire

ABSTRACT

In 1984, a study was conducted to assess the degree to which the goals of the National Hispanic Scholar Awards Program were being met. The purposes of the study were to: (1) describe the pool of applicants in 1983-84, the program's first year, and compare Hispanic Scholars (winners) with Hispanic Honorable Mentions (awardees) and Semifinalists who did not receive an award; (2) examine the characteristics of high-achieving Hispanic students; and (3) isolate the factors associated with success in college. Data on 1,297 of the 1,479 students eligible to apply for the awards program from the Student Descriptive Questionnaire (SDQ), were used. In addition, a 12-page student survey was sent to all 750 program applicants to collect information on the applicants' academic and educational background, English language use, and experiences during the freshman year in college. Five hundred and thirty-one applicants responded. In 1983-84 eligibility for participation in the awards program was limited to Mexican American and Puerto Ricans since these were the only two categories used on the PSAT/NMSQT to identify students as Hispanic. High achieving Hispanics received good academic preparation in high school, had GPAs and SAT scores substantially above the mean for either White or Hispanic SAT-takers, and were well integrated into their high schools. These students attended selective four-year colleges and lived on campus. Most majored in physical science and related areas. During their freshman year, these students encountered few problems, performed well academically, and were active in extracurricular activities. Suggestions to expand the opportunities for success in higher education to the majority of Hispanics who do not possess the characteristics or experiences of the sample group are given. This document contains 50 references and 74 tables. Appendices include a comparison of mainland and commonwealth Puerto Ricans, the selection process for the National Hispanic Scholar Awards Program, and the student questionnaire used in the study. (ALL)

ED305204

College Board
Report

No. 88-10

SCOPE OF INTEREST NOTICE

The ERIC Facility has assigned this document for processing to: FL

In our judgment, this document is also of interest to the Clearinghouses noted to the right. Indexing should reflect their special points of view. UD

The National Hispanic Scholar Awards Program

A Descriptive Analysis of High-Achieving Hispanic Students

Beatriz Chu Clewell
Myra Ficklen Joy

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Patricia K. Hendel

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

The National Hispanic Scholar Awards Program

A Descriptive Analysis of High-Achieving Hispanic Students

Beatriz Chu Clewell
Myra Ficklen Joy

College Board Report No. 88-10
ETS RR No. 56

College Entrance Examination Board, New York, 1988

Beatriz Chu Clewell is a research scientist at Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey.
Myra Ficklen Joy is a research associate at Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey.

Acknowledgments

This study benefited from the assistance of many people. Thanks are extended to the College Board/ETS Joint Staff Research and Development Committee (JSRDC) for supporting the study and to the ETS staff of the National Hispanic Scholar Awards Program, Nadine Chapman and Dee Ann Wagner, for their help.

Special thanks are also extended to the ETS staff who helped us on this project: Thelma Benton, Joyce Gant, María Mercedes López, Len Ramist, Paul Rosenbaum, Jim Rosso, and Gita Wilder.

The final report benefited from the comments and suggestions of several people, particularly Joan Baratz-Snowden, Hunter Breland, Evelyn Davila (program director of NHSAP), María Pennock-Román, and William Turnbull. Thanks also to the students at Princeton University who participated in the field test and to our editors at the College Board, Renée Gernand and Janet Falcone, for their thorough and insightful editing of the manuscript. And finally, a very special thank-you to the National Hispanic Semifinalists, who are the subjects of this report. We wish them well.

Researchers are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment. Therefore, points of view or opinions stated in College Board Reports do not necessarily represent official College Board position or policy.

The College Board is a nonprofit membership organization that provides tests and other educational services for students, schools, and colleges. The membership is composed of more than 2,500 colleges, schools, school systems, and education associations. Representatives of the members serve on the Board of Trustees and advisory councils and committees that consider the programs of the College Board and participate in the determination of its policies and activities.

Additional copies of this report may be obtained from College Board Publications, Box 886, New York, New York 10101-0886. The price is $6.

Copyright © 1988 by College Entrance Examination Board. All rights reserved.

College Board, Scholastic Aptitude Test, SAT, Advanced Placement, and the acorn logo are registered trademarks of the College Entrance Examination Board. Printed in the United States of America.

CONTENTS

Abstract 1

Introduction 1
  Family Socioeconomic Background 2
  Language Background 2
  High School Preparation and Experiences 2
  Access to and Participation in Higher Education 2

The Study 4
  The Program 4
  Respondents 5
  Data Sources 5
  Definitions 6

Findings 6
  Demographic Background 6
  Language Background 10
  High School Preparation 12
  High School Activities 18
  College Selection 20
  First Year in College 24
  Student Perception of Program Benefits 29
  Further Comparison of Winners and Nonwinners on Selected Variables 30
  Predicting First-Year Performance 31

Conclusions and Recommendations 36
  General Discussion of Findings 36
  Suggestions for Policy 39
  Program Benefits 39
  Further Research 41

Appendix A: Comparison of Mainland and Commonwealth Puerto Ricans 42
  Demographic Background 42
  Language Background 45
  High School Preparation 46
  College Selection 49
  First Year in College 53
  Conclusion 56

Appendix B: Selection Process 57

Appendix C: Survey of National Hispanic Scholars Questionnaire 58

References 72

Tables

1. Response Rates For Student Descriptive Questionnaire 6
2. Response Rates for 12-Page Student Questionnaire 6
3. Hispanic Subgroup Identity of Eligible Students 7
4. Hispanic Subgroup Identity by Award Category 7
5. Eligible Students by Sex 7
6. Success Rate by Sex 7
7. Birthplace of Semifinalists and Their Parents 8
8. Father's Occupation 8

9. Mother's Occupation 8
10. Parental Education (Median Number of Years) 8
11. Father's Education Level 9
12. Mother's Education Level 9
13. Parental Income 9
14. Parental Income of Semifinalists Compared with That of SAT-Takers 9
15. Number of Persons Dependent on Parental Income 10
16. First Language Spoken as a Child 10
17. Language Spoken with High School Friends 10
18. Language Spoken in Home 10
19. Self-Assessment of English Proficiency 11
20. Self-Assessment of Spanish Proficiency 11
21. English as Best Language 11
22. Type of High School and Program 12
23. Proportion of Hispanic Students in High School 13
24. Hispanic Teachers and Guidance Counselors in High School 13
25. Counseling in High School 13
26. Provider of Counseling 13
27. Person Who Encouraged Student in Academic Career 14
28. School Attendance outside United States 14
29. Number of Years of Academic Study by Subject 15
30. Proportion Taking Advanced Courses 16
31. Proportion Planning to Apply for College Credit 16
32. High School Honors or Awards 16
33. Mean High School GPA, SAT Scores, and Achievement Test Scores 17
34. Self-Ratings of Academic Abilities 18
35. Level of Participation in High School Activities 18
36. Type of High School Activities 19
37. Special High School Activities 19
38. Participation in Bilingual/Bicultural Programs 19
39. Part-Time Work 20
40. Part-Time Work by Subgroup Who Held Jobs 20
41. Mean Hours per Week of Part-Time Work, Including Nonworkers 21
42. "Very Important" Factors Affecting College Choice 21
43. Application to College 21
44. Type of College Attended 21
45. Institutions Attended by Hispanic Semifinalists 22
46. Intended Majors 23
47. Educational Aspirations by Degree Level 23
48. Self-Reported First-Year Grades 24
49. Self-Reported First-Year Grades by Sex 24
50. Freshman-Year Courses 25
51. Courses for Students of Non-English-Speaking Background 25
52. First-Year Academic Difficulty 25
53. Problems in Adjusting to College 26
54. Problems in Adjusting to College by Sex 27
55. Activities in Freshman Year by Sex 27
56. Freshman-Year Living Arrangements 28
57. Distance of College from Parents' Home 28
58. Proportion Receiving Financial Aid 28
59. Money Owed at End of Freshman Year 29
60. Source of Student Knowledge of NHSAP 29
61. Student Perception of Effects of Designation as National Hispanic Semifinalist 30
62. Institutional Use of Winners' Awards 30
63. Sophomore-Year Replacement of Award Funds 30
64. Family Background Variables (Winners versus Nonwinners) 30

65. Language Use (Winners versus Nonwinners) 31
66. High School Experience (Winners versus Nonwinners) 31
67. Freshman-Year Performance (Winners versus Nonwinners) 31
68. Prediction of First-Year Academic Performance 33
69. Prediction of First-Year Academic Performance (Including Award Status as Predictor) 33
70. Prediction of Award Category from High School Grades and SAT Scores 34
71. Freshman-Year Social Integration 34
72. Freshman-Year Problems 35
73. Intercorrelation of Freshman-Year Grades, Activities, and Problems 36
74. Partial Correlations of Freshman-Year Grades, Activities, and Problems (Controlling for SAT Scores) 36
A.1. Father's Occupation 43
A.2. Mother's Occupation 43
A.3. Father's Education Level 44
A.4. Mother's Education Level 44
A.5. Parental Income 44
A.6. Number of Persons Dependent on Parental Income 44
A.7. First Language Spoken as a Child 45
A.8. Language Spoken in Home 45
A.9. Language Used among Friends 46
A.10. Self-Assessment of English Proficiency 46
A.11. Self-Assessment of Spanish Proficiency 46
A.12. Type of High School and Program 47
A.13. High School Class Size 47
A.14. Proportion of Hispanic Students in High School 48
A.15. Number of Years of Academic Study by Subject 49
A.16. Proportion Taking Advanced Courses 50
A.17. Mean High School GPA, SAT Scores, and Achievement Test Scores 50
A.18. Participation in High School Activities 50
A.19. Part-Time Work 51
A.20. "Very Important" Factors Affecting College Choice 51
A.21. Type of College Attended 51
A.22. Institutions Attended by Puerto Rican Semifinalists 52
A.23. Intended Majors 52
A.24. Educational Aspirations by Degree Level 53
A.25. Self-Reported First-Year College Grades 53
A.26. First-Year Academic Difficulty 54
A.27. Freshman-Year Living Arrangements 54
A.28. Distance of College from Parents' Home 54
A.29. Proportion Receiving Financial Aid 55
A.30. Money Owed at End of Freshman Year 55
A.31. Major Problems Encountered 55

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to

- Describe the pool of National Hispanic Scholar Awards Program applicants in the program's initial year, 1983–84, and compare Hispanic Scholars (winners) with Hispanic Honorable Mentions (awardees) and Semifinalists who did not receive an award
- Examine the characteristics of high-achieving Hispanic students
- Isolate the factors associated with success in college

To fulfill this purpose, we used data from the Student Descriptive Questionnaire (SDQ),which includes background information on all SAT-takers, and administered a 12-page survey to 1983–84 applicants to the program. This survey collected additional information on applicants' academic and educational background, English language use, and experiences during the freshman year in college.

High-achieving Hispanic students, as represented by applicants to the program, resemble the white cohort of college-bound students more than they do the Hispanic cohort in terms of socioeconomic background. They received a good academic preparation in high school, had high school GPAs and SAT scores substantially above the mean for either white or Hispanic SAT-takers, and were well integrated into their high schools. These students attended selective four-year colleges, where they lived on campus. A large portion majored in physical science and related areas. During their freshman year, although they found college somewhat more difficult than expected, the students encountered few problems, performed well academically, and were active in extracurricular activities.

As a means of isolating factors associated with success in college, three outcome measures were selected to examine freshman-year performance: academic performance as indicated by first-year grades; social integration into the college as measured by the number of extracurricular activities during the freshman year; and adjustment to college life as indicated by responses to a question on problems of adjustment. Among the variables we examined, the best predictors of freshman grades were found to be high school GPA and SAT scores. A major in physical science, mathematics, or engineering was predictive of lower grades. Living on campus, number of activities in high school, being male, and living at a distance from the family home were the best predictors of the number of activities in which a student participated in college. High levels of English proficiency and father's education predicted fewer problems in adjustment, while greater distance from home was predictive of more problems. Implications of the findings are discussed, along with recommendations for program modification and general suggestions for further research.

INTRODUCTION

The access of Hispanics to equal educational opportunity and their participation in the educational process assume greater importance as their number grows. The Hispanic population in the United States is increasing at a rate six times greater than that of the nation as a whole; it is predicted that by the year 2020 Hispanics will constitute the country's largest minority group (Hodgkinson 1985). Furthermore, the Hispanic population is generally younger than the national population; 48 percent of all Hispanics are 20 or under compared with 34 percent of the total United States population (Hispanic Policy Development Project [HPDP] 1984, vol. 2). By 1992 the total number of high school graduates who are Hispanic could increase from the current level of about 6 percent to 15 percent (HPDP 1984). This age distribution has serious implications for the educational system, the well-being of Hispanics as a group, and the progress of the United States as a democratic, pluralistic society.

Hispanic education today is beset with problems relating to both access to equal educational opportunity and achievement in the educational system. Although the educational aspirations of Hispanics are high (HPDP 1984; Nielsen and Fernández 1981), Hispanics drop out of high school at a greater rate than do whites or blacks (Astin 1982; HPDP 1984; Moore and Pachón 1985), have lower grade point averages in high school and perform less ably than whites on standardized tests (Brown et al. 1980; Durán 1983, 1986; HPDP 1984), enroll in four-year institutions at a lower rate than do whites or blacks (Astin 1982; Santos 1986; Verdugo 1986; Wilson and Meléndez 1985), and drop out of college at a greater rate than do whites or blacks (Astin 1982; de los Santos, Jr., Montemayor, and Solís 1980). The reasons for this differential participation and performance on the part of Hispanics are complex and involve a number of factors that are unique to this particular group, such as language background and length of residence in the United States.

Research has been complicated by the diversity among the groups that make up the Hispanic population. These have typically been classified as Mexican Americans, or Chicanos; Puerto Ricans (Commonwealth and mainland); Cubans; and "other Hispanics," mainly from the Dominican Republic, Colombia, Argentina, Ecuador, Nicaragua, and El Salvador. Not only do these subpopulations differ with regard to income levels, educational attainment, and geographic concentration, but they also show great variation in language background and length of residence in the United States.

Most research on Hispanics and their educational progress focuses on factors that are associated with access to, and achievement in, the educational system: socioeconomic status, language, high school preparation and completion, and participation in higher education.

Family Socioeconomic Background

Family socioeconomic background, often measured by family income, parents' education, and parents' occupation, is seen by several researchers as an important factor in Hispanic educational achievement; students of higher socioeconomic levels are more likely to do well in high school and to go on to higher education (Ballesteros 1986; Brown et al. 1980; Durán 1983; Ford Foundation 1984; HPDP 1984; Nielsen and Fernández 1981). Cuban Americans, for example, who on average have a higher income level than Mexican Americans or Puerto Ricans (Moore and Pachón 1985), also demonstrate greater rates of access to college than do the other two groups (Durán 1983; Santos 1986). A study of the status and progress of Puerto Ricans in higher education in the United States concluded that a higher parental income as well as a high-status occupation for the father were reliable predictors of persistence in college (Kent 1982). At the same time, it must be noted that the average college-bound Hispanic student is more likely to come from a lower socioeconomic background than his or her white counterpart (Arbeiter 1984). Noboa-Ríos (1982), in his study of Hispanic doctoral recipients, found that the demographic characteristics and family backgrounds of Hispanic doctoral degree recipients more closely resembled those of lower socioeconomic Hispanic undergraduates than of white undergraduates.

Length of family residence in the United States has also been found to be negatively related to achievement. Researchers have explained this rather surprising finding in terms of the presence of a selection process that might be associated with immigration (Nielsen and Fernández 1981) or the possibility that long-term Hispanic families have been ghettoized as a result of their marginal status in society (Baral 1979; Kimball 1968).

A related phenomenon is the finding by Ortiz (1986), in an analysis of the Youth Cohort of the National Longitudinal Surveys of Labor Market Experiences, that the impact of parents' education on educational attainment is weaker among the second generation of Hispanics than among other generations of Hispanics or among non-Hispanic whites. She concludes that "second-generation Hispanic youth have significantly *higher* [emphasis in original] achievements after controlling for family background, while third-generation youth do not differ significantly from non-Hispanic white youth" (p. 43). This echoes similar findings by Cooney et al. (1980) and Peñalosa and McDonagh (1966) that parental characteristics have a stronger impact on the achievements of the first and third generations than on the second generation.

Language Background

A major portion of the research on language background factors is focused on issues relating to bilingual education. In the studies on the effect of language on educational attainment, proficiency in English is acknowledged to be an important predictor of educational achievement (Durán 1983; Ford Foundation 1984; Nielsen and Fernández 1981). Although Fligstein and Fernández (1982) suggest that Hispanics who are English-monolingual approximate the high school degree completion rate of whites, there is some evidence that proficiency in English and proficiency in Spanish are both associated with higher achievement levels (Durán 1983; Nielsen and Fernández 1981). Cuban Americans, who show the most background exposure to Spanish, also have the highest frequency of college attendance among Hispanics. On the other hand, students who report using Spanish more frequently than English appear to be lower achievers (Nielsen and Fernández 1981). As can be seen, a distinguishing characteristic of United States Hispanic students is their language background and bilingualism. In 1976 approximately 81 percent of Hispanic college students came from non-English-speaking backgrounds (where Spanish, presumably, was the language spoken most often). Only 30 percent of Hispanic college students reported that they were from a totally non-English background; only 11 percent spoke only English despite their being from a household where a non-English language was frequently spoken. Fully 67 percent of Hispanic college students reported frequent or occasional use of a non-English language (Brown et al. 1980). Noboa-Ríos (1982) found that 64 percent of Hispanic doctoral recipients spoke Spanish at home "frequently" or "all the time" as children, compared with 21 percent who spoke English frequently or all the time. Thus, the exposure to bilingualism and the use of Spanish by United States Hispanic college students are extensive.

High School Preparation and Experiences

Hispanics' high school preparation and experiences as they relate to successful completion of high school and successful participation in higher education have been studied by several researchers (Ballesteros 1986; Brown et al. 1980; Cabrera 1978; Durán 1983; HPDP

1984; Nielsen and Fernández 1981). High school has been identified as one of the major dropout points in the educational pipeline for Hispanics (Astin 1982; Santos 1986). Payán, Peterson, and Castille (1984) cite the low secondary school completion rate as the single most important reason for the low rate of Mexican American college attendance. Although there are disagreements regarding the actual rate of Hispanic attrition from high school, this group is acknowledged to have a higher dropout rate than do either blacks or whites (Astin 1982; Astin and Burciaga 1981; HPDP 1984; Kent 1982; Moore and Pachón 1985).

Among the factors that affect persistence and achievement of Hispanics in high school are socioeconomic status, language background, access to quality education, and sociocultural and socialization factors (Ballesteros 1986; Brown et al. 1980; Cabrera 1978; Carter and Segura 1979; Durán 1983; HPDP 1984; Nielsen and Fernández 1981; Ortiz 1986; Ramírez 1981; Ryan and Carranza 1975; U.S. Commission on Civil Rights 1973). Differential access to quality education in high school has been seen as an important factor affecting the achievement of Hispanics in high school. Over two-thirds of all Hispanics attend schools where over 50 percent of the students are minorities (Baratz-Snowden and Durán 1987; Orum 1986). According to a recent study, the segregation of Hispanic students has risen (Orfield 1987). The increase in segregation is particularly dramatic in the areas where the Hispanic population is concentrated and increasing rapidly. The effect of this de facto segregation among Hispanic students has yet to be determined. Nevertheless, segregation is usually associated with inferior resources for schooling. Furthermore, high school achievement rates and participation in higher education have been found to be higher for Puerto Ricans attending primarily Anglo schools (Mahard 1978).

The lack of adequate counseling for Hispanic students and their greater tendency to enroll in general and vocational programs in high school as opposed to the more demanding academic programs (HPDP 1984) are further examples of Hispanics' lack of access to quality education. Placement in an academic track in high school has been found to be more highly related to educational aspirations than to socioeconomic status (Ballesteros 1986) and to be related to higher achievement in both high school and college (Ballesteros 1986; Santos 1986). Durán (1986) has connected the lower enrollment of Hispanics in the academic track with their tendency to take fewer hours in core areas related to college work (English and mathematics) and thus to show lower college qualifications than do nonminority college candidates. Differential treatment of Hispanic students by teachers has also been mentioned as a factor affecting the quality of instruction received by this group. In a study of Mexican American education in selected elementary and secondary grades, researchers found that teachers directed praise or encouragement to Anglo students more frequently than to Mexican American students and that they asked Anglo students more questions in class than they asked Mexican Americans (U.S. Commission on Civil Rights 1973). How much this treatment may have been influenced by the Mexican American students' proficiency in English was not explored in the study, but other research has cited evidence of negative perceptions on the part of teachers toward Hispanic students' nonstandard or accented speech (Ramírez 1981; Ryan and Carranza 1975).

Sociocultural and socialization factors may affect Hispanics' achievement in high school. Teachers' ascription of cultural stereotypes to Hispanic students may lead to negative perceptions and lowered expectations relative to those of Anglo students (Carter and Segura 1979). The bona fide cultural values cited by Carter and Segura, which emphasize Hispanic students' concern with the family, may explain that in identifying factors that interfered with secondary school work, Hispanic students reported being affected by family-related matters much more frequently than did white students (Brown et al. 1980).

Access to and Participation in Higher Education

The factors affecting participation and success in higher education include high school achievement, performance on standardized tests, educational aspirations, access to financial assistance, as well as socioeconomic status and language background. High social class status and placement in a college preparatory program are related to enrollment in higher education (Ballesteros 1986; Santos 1986). Achievement in high school is a strong predictor of success in higher education for Hispanics (Astin and Burciaga 1981; Kent 1982; Noboa-Ríos 1982), although Kent found self-rating of academic ability to be even more accurate in predicting successful educational outcomes among Puerto Rican college students. A great deal of research (with conflicting findings) relates to whether or not high school grades and admissions test scores are valid predictors of Hispanic students' grades in college (see Durán 1983 for a review of the studies).

Nielsen and Fernández (1981) cite educational aspirations as one of the best predictors of actual achievement. They conclude, however, that with the exception of Cubans, Hispanics generally have lower educational aspirations than do either blacks or whites when the level of aspiration is calculated as the percentage of a group who expect to achieve at least a college degree. Socioeconomic status and high school curriculum placement have a statistically significant effect on both aptitude and educational aspirations (Ballesteros 1986). However, in comparison with other socioeconomic factors such as parents' education or occupation, parental income has been found to be the least important influence on college attendance (Santos 1986).

The availability of financial aid is an important factor affecting both Hispanic enrollment in higher education and choice of institution. Research on student concerns and stress shows that Hispanic students at both the high school and college levels are much more worried about finances than are white students (Brown et al 1980; Muñoz 1986). So (1984) found that a large proportion of Hispanic parents indicated lack of money as a reason for not sending their children to college. This study also found that lack of financial assistance was largely responsible for the parents' choice of two-year or public colleges for their children and for the children's living at home instead of on a college campus, a situation that has been found to inhibit success in college (Astin and Burciaga 1981).

In discussing issues in higher education finance that have major implications for Hispanics in higher education, Olivas (1986) cited research that found some underutilization in campus-based loan programs for two-year colleges (Gladieux 1975 and Nelson 1980, cited in Olivas 1986). He found that attending a public two-year college meant that students were less likely to receive aid and that they received a lower proportion of aid in the form of grants or scholarships than did students attending other types of institutions. Hispanics, given their high rate of enrollment in two-year colleges, are disproportionately affected by this uneven distribution of aid. Olivas also looked at financial packaging policies and how these affect Hispanic students. He cited research that suggests that Hispanic students take on disproportionately large levels of indebtedness (*The Condition of Education*, 1980, and Wagner and Rice 1977, cited in Olivas 1986), although this finding was not supported in his own study of Hispanic freshmen (1986). Olivas did find, however, an "extraordinary reliance" of Hispanic students upon Pell Grants, "almost to the exclusion of other forms of aid" (p. 290). This, he thinks, makes the student particularly vulnerable to government cutbacks of Pell Grants. One reason for the lack of comprehensive, multisource financial aid packages for Hispanics may be the difficulty many Hispanic families experience in negotiating the aid application process (Olivas 1986).

Several studies have documented the rates of participation, attrition, and field choice in higher education for Hispanics (Astin 1982; Brown et al. 1980; Cabrera 1978; de los Santos, Jr., Montemayor, and Solís 1980; Payán, Peterson, and Castille 1984). Astin and Burciaga (1981) examined characteristics of Mexican American freshmen over the decade of the 1970s; Kent (1982) did the same for Puerto Rican freshmen. There have, however, been no studies focusing on the characteristics and educational experiences of the high-achieving Hispanic student. This report will contribute to filling this gap in the research.

THE STUDY

At the outset, the objectives of this study were to describe the pool of National Hispanic Scholar Awards Program (NHSAP) applicants, to examine the characteristics of high-achieving Hispanic students, and to isolate the factors associated with success in college. In terms of assessing the impact of the National Hispanic Scholar Awards Program as it operated in its first year, we attempted to

- Describe the characteristics of winners and determine how they compare with honorable mentions and semifinalists who did not receive the awards
- Determine what effect the awards had on students' educational decision making

By examining these issues, we intended to assess the degree to which the program objectives are being met. By comparing scholars, honorable mentions, and semifinalists on both high school preparation and academic performance during the first year in college, we hoped to learn more about the efficacy of the selection criteria and the extent to which top Hispanic high school students in the pool are being honored.

As we began our research and learned more about the program, the availability and limitations of data, and the needs and concerns of the program administrators, the focus shifted from our original intent (as described above) to an emphasis on a descriptive analysis of high-achieving Hispanic students who applied to the program. The following paragraphs describe the program, the evolution of the study, and the purpose of the study as it was actually carried out.

The Program

The National Hispanic Scholar Awards Program was started in 1983, with funding from the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, as an effort to enhance Hispanic participation in baccalaureate programs. Initial funding was received for a three-year period, with awards to 250 Hispanic Scholars in the first year, 350 in the second year, and 500 in the third year. The NHSAP is intended to serve three broad purposes:

- To recognize the exceptional academic achievements of Hispanic high school seniors and encourage their participation in four-year colleges

- To identify academically well-prepared Hispanic high school seniors for collegiate postsecondary institutions and encourage their recruitment
- To focus renewed attention on the academic preparation of all Hispanic high school students.

Because the major focus of the program is the recognition of high-achieving Hispanic students and because program administrators were most interested in the descriptive analysis and in determining how the scholars performed during their freshman year in college, the descriptive analysis became our primary focus. This aspect was consistent with the initial evaluation plan in assessing how well the program was able to identify high-achieving Hispanic students who performed well as freshmen.

Because the study was intended to serve both program administrators and individuals interested in issues concerned with higher education generally, we analyzed the data in two ways. For most descriptions that were relevant to the program and the performance of Hispanic Semifinalists during their freshman year in college, we compared winners, honorable mentions, and nonwinners. For other descriptions—such as family background, high school experiences, and intended major—for which we had comparable data on Hispanic students who had taken the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT), we made comparisons by Hispanic subgroup to compare the program candidates with Hispanic SAT-takers.

Several reviewers of the final draft suggested that we divide the Puerto Rican sample into mainland and Commonwealth groups for further analysis. (This analysis is reported in Appendix A.) It should be pointed out, however, that the ability to generalize the findings from these groups is limited. First, the numbers are very small. A second and more serious limitation is that almost all Commonwealth applicants were from private schools. In the first year of the program, eligible students in the Commonwealth were identified from the Preliminary Scholastic Aptitude Test/National Merit Scholarship Qualifying Test (PSAT/NMSQT), which in Puerto Rico is given primarily in private schools. (Procedures have been changed so that the applicant pool now includes both public and private school students.)

Assessing the effect of the NHSAP award on students' educational decision making was more problematic. We were unable to determine the actual effects of the award because of the data limitations and the timing of the award. First, we could not compare winners and nonwinners because of the low response rate of nonwinners to the 12-page student questionnaire. Since our (and the program administrators') greatest concerns were with the winners and their college performance freshman year, we concentrated our efforts on that group. Second, another factor that limits an analysis of true "program effects" is the timing of the award. Students are identified from the PSAT and must be planning to attend a four-year college to be eligible to apply. Furthermore, students are notified of their designation as a semifinalist in the fall of their high school senior year, at about the same time they are applying to colleges. The students do not learn whether they have received the award until spring, after college applications have been submitted and many students have made decisions. Thus, it is not possible to know what students would have done without the award. To obtain some indication of program effects on student behavior, we asked students about their perceptions of the awards and the effect on their final college decision. (Some students may have been notified about the award before making a final decision on a college.)

We had also planned to assess the second goal of the program: "To identify academically well-prepared Hispanic high school seniors to collegiate postsecondary institutions and encourage their recruitment." To address this objective, the NHSAP had intended to send a roster of the students identified as eligible from the PSAT/NMSQT scores to all four-year colleges for use in recruiting Hispanic students. Because of some administrative problems, the list was not sent to the colleges in time for recruitment.

Our report therefore focuses primarily on providing a profile of the first cohort of applicants and their experiences during their freshman year in college. Because the program changed its selection process after the first year, the cohort described in this study differs somewhat from applicants in subsequent years. Therefore, the reader should keep in mind that we describe only a single cohort of applicants to the NHSAP and that the findings may not apply to subsequent applicants or to Hispanic students generally.

Respondents

The respondent pool consists of 750 Hispanic students who applied to the National Hispanic Scholar Awards Program in the school year 1983–84 and an additional group of 729 students who were identified as eligible but who chose not to apply. (See Appendix B for a description of the program's selection procedures.)

Data Sources

All data on students are based on self-reports. The information was taken either from the Student Descriptive Questionnaire or from responses to a mail survey (described below) sent to all program applicants. Information reported by students may not always reflect actual behavior.

Student Descriptive Questionnaire (SDQ)

This optional questionnaire is filled out by SAT-takers at the time they register to take the test. The SDQ contains information on demographic and academic background and educational plans. On the basis of SDQ responses Hispanics are classified as Mexican Americans or Puerto Ricans, and data are reported separately for these two subgroups. Responses to questions about family income and parental education are considered confidential and were not made available to us. We obtained this information through the survey sent to program applicants but do not have this information for nonapplicants.

From information included in the SDQ (Table 1), we were able to obtain background data on 1,297 of the 1,479 students eligible to apply for the National Hispanic Scholar Awards Program. We divided the students into winners, honorable mentions, nonwinners, and nonapplicants to see how these groups differ (nonapplicants are students who were eligible to apply but did not do so). For the most part, we have focused our analysis on applicants. In the few cases where we believe the available information on nonapplicants to be useful, we have included information on all program candidates. Analysis of this background data was also intended to increase our knowledge about high-achieving Hispanic students in general.

The 12-Page Student Questionnaire

In addition to the SDQ we obtained information from a 12-page questionnaire (reproduced in Appendix C) that we sent in summer 1985 to all 750 program applicants. We received 531 responses (Table 2). The questionnaire requested additional information on academic and educational background, English language use, and applicants' experiences during the freshman year in college.

Definitions

In reporting the results of our study, we use the term *Hispanic Scholars* or *National Hispanic Scholars* to refer to winners of the $1,500 scholarship awards.

All applicants to the program (including the winners) are called *Hispanic Semifinalists* or *National Hispanic Semifinalists*. This definition is consistent with the way the program currently defines this group. During the first year (1983–84), the term *Hispanic Semifinalists* included students who had been invited to apply and who had affirmed their candidacy through a response card.

Both applicants and nonapplicants who were invited to apply are referred to as *Hispanic Program Candidates* or *National Hispanic Program Candidates*.

Table 1. Response Rates for Student Descriptive Questionnaire

Program Category	*N*	*SDQ Available*	*%*
Winners	250	245	98.0
Honorable mentions	250	229	91.6
Nonwinners	250	243	97.2
Nonapplicants	729	580	79.6

Table 2. Response Rates for 12-Page Student Questionnaire

*Program Category**	*Questionnaires Sent*	*Questionnaires Returned*	*Percentage Returned*
Winners	250	211	84.4
Honorable mentions	250	172	68.8
Nonwinners	250	148	59.2
Total	750	531	70.8

* Nonapplicants were not sent a questionnaire.

FINDINGS

Data from the SDQ as well as responses to the 12-page student questionnaire provided a description of the demographic backgrounds, high school preparation, and freshman-year college experiences of our sample of high-achieving Hispanic students. For nonapplicants we have information only from the SDQ. The resulting profile of high-achieving Hispanic students is given in the report that follows.

These data were also analyzed to isolate factors predictive of success in the college freshman year. The methodology and results of this analysis are described in the section titled Predicting First-Year Performance, which begins on page 31.

We also examined several facets of the program to determine student perception of the awards and the appropriateness of selection criteria.

Demographic Background

Hispanic Subgroup Identity

In 1983–84, the first year of the National Hispanic Scholar Awards Program, eligibility was limited to Mexican Americans and Puerto Ricans, since these were the only two ethnic categories on the PSAT/NMSQT to identify students as Hispanic. (An additional designation, "Latin American, South American, Central American, or Other Hispanic," has since been added to the ethnic identification section of the test.)

A few students identified themselves as "other" on the SAT, where we obtained the information on ethnicity; this could be an error or an indication that students belong to another Hispanic group and do not identify themselves as either Mexican American or Puerto Rican.

The largest proportion of National Hispanic Program Candidates are Mexican American (Table 3). This reflects the larger proportion of Mexican Americans in the Hispanic population. The chance of success, however, is about the same for both Mexican Americans and Puerto Ricans: about 36 percent of the Mexican American applicants received awards compared with 34 percent of the Puerto Ricans (Table 4). Ethnic identification was taken from the SDQ, and not all program candidates provided this information.

The cohort of Puerto Rican semifinalists contains 144 students from the mainland and 54 from the Commonwealth who completed the SDQ information. Of these, 95 (66 percent) mainland Puerto Ricans and 40 (74 percent) Commonwealth Puerto Ricans responded to the 12-page student questionnaire. There is support in the literature for our suspicions that the two groups differ (Durán 1983; Kent 1982; Noboa-Ríos 1982). We therefore refined some of our analyses to compare them. This comparison of the two groups appears in Appendix A: Comparison of Mainland and Commonwealth Puerto Ricans.

Table 3. Hispanic Subgroup Identity of Eligible Students

	Winners		*Honorable Mentions*		*Non-winners*		*Non-applicants*	
	N	*%*	*N*	*%*	*N*	*%*	*N*	*%*
Mexican American	160	69	143	67	138	60	344	64
Puerto Rican	67	29	63	29	68	30	145	27
Other Hispanic	6	3	8	4	23	10	49	9
Total	233		214		229		538	

Note: Total % may not equal 100% because of rounding.

Table 4. Hispanic Subgroup Identity by Award Category

	Mexican American		*Puerto Rican*		*Other Hispanic*	
	N	*%*	*N*	*%*	*N*	*%*
Winners	160	36	67	34	6	16
Honorable mentions	143	32	63	32	8	22
Nonwinners	138	31	68	34	23	62
Total	441		198		37	

Table 6. Success Rate by Sex

	Total Applicants	*Winners as Applicants*	
	N	*N*	*%*
Female	307	116	37.8
Male	410	129	31.5

Gender

Approximately 40 percent of those eligible are female and 60 percent are male (Table 5). Although there were more male than female winners in the eligible group, the percentage of female winners in the applicant cohort was 38 percent compared with 32 percent for males (Table 6). Of those eligible, more males than females failed to apply (63.8 percent versus 36.2 percent), as shown in Table 5.

Birthplace

Most Hispanic Semifinalists were born in the United States (Table 7): 87 percent of winners, 85 percent of honorable mentions, and 86 percent of nonwinners. Over half have parents who were born in the United States, although the proportion of winners with those parents is smaller than for the other two groups.

Parents' Occupation

Over half of all groups of semifinalists are from professional families, as indicated by the father's occupation (Table 8). One-fourth or over are from families where the mother is a professional (Table 9). Very few students have parents who work in unskilled jobs. Fewer than one-third have mothers who are homemakers and not employed in another job.

Table 5. Eligible Students by Sex

	Eligible N	*Eligible %*	*Winners %*	*Honorable Mentions %*	*Nonwinners %*	*Non-applicants %*
Female	517	39.9	47.3	46.3	35.0	36.2
Male	780	60.1	52.7	53.7	65.0	63.8

Note: Totals do not match Tables 3 and 4 because of missing data on gender and ethnicity.

Table 7. Birthplace of Semifinalists and Their Parents (in percentages)

(N)	*Winners (211)*	*Honorable Mentions (168)*	*Nonwinners (145)*
Father born in U.S.	56%	65%	68%
Mother born in U.S.	59	61	58
Semifinalist born in U.S.	87	85	86

Table 8. Father's Occupation (in percentages)

(N)	*Winners (196)*	*Honorable Mentions (162)*	*Nonwinners (140)*
Professional/manager/owner	58%	56%	53%
Skilled/clerical/sales	19	22	23
Service/unskilled	14	11	15
Farmer	2	1	0
Unemployed/retired	7	11	9

Table 9. Mother's Occupation (in percentages)

(N)	*Winners (202)*	*Honorable Mentions (168)*	*Nonwinners (144)*
Professional/manager/owner	28%	25%	35%
Skilled/clerical/sales	24	33	31
Service/unskilled	9	7	8
Homemaker	29	29	22
Unemployed/retired	9	5	4

Parents' Education

Consistent with the high proportion of professional families is the high level of education of the parents (Table 10).

National Hispanic Semifinalists overall are from better-educated families than the pool of Hispanic SAT-takers generally. With the exception of Commonwealth Puerto Ricans, their parents' education more closely resembles that of white SAT-takers. Puerto Ricans residing in the Commonwealth show the highest education levels. For mainland Puerto Ricans, winners have somewhat less educated fathers than honorable mentions do, but other differences among award categories are small.

Over 40 percent of each group have fathers who have a college degree or higher (Table 11), and 30 percent of mothers have at least a baccalaureate degree (Table 12). Education levels for fathers among the three groups are similar, although a higher proportion of winners (15 percent) are from families where the father has only a grade school education, compared with honorable mentions (10 percent) and nonwinners (4 percent). The proportion of college-educated fathers is about the same for all three groups (Table 11).

A larger proportion of winners (16 percent) have mothers with only a grade school education, compared with honorable mentions (7 percent) and nonwinners (5 percent). About the same proportion of mothers of all groups hold college and graduate degrees (Table 12).

Parental Income

Most students are from families of middle and upper incomes, with winners only slightly less well-off than

Table 10. Parental Education (Median Number of Years)

	Winners	*Honorable Mentions*	*Nonwinners*	*Hispanic SAT-Takers**	*White SAT-Takers**
Mexican American					
Father's education	14.0	14.0	13.5	12.0	
Mother's education	13.0	13.0	14.0	11.8	
Puerto Rican: Mainland					
Father's education	14.0	16.0	14.0	12.0	
Mother's education	13.5	13.0	14.0	12.0	
Puerto Rican: Commonwealth					
Father's education	18.0	17.0	18.0	—	
Mother's education	16.0	16.0	16.0	—	
White					
Father's education					14.3
Mother's education					13.6

**Source:* Arbeiter. *Profiles, College-Bound Seniors, 1984.*

Table 11. Father's Education Level (in percentages)

(N)	Winners (202)	Honorable Mentions (164)	Nonwinners (142)
Grade school	15%	10%	4%
Some high school	8	7	10
High school graduate	12	16	20
Business/trade school	5	9	6
Some college	12	12	14
Associate degree	5	3	6
Baccalaureate degree	12	17	12
Some graduate/professional school	4	3	3
Graduate/professional degree	27	24	27

Table 12. Mother's Education Level (in percentages)

(N)	Winners (199)	Honorable Mentions (169)	Nonwinners (145)
Grade school	16%	7%	5%
Some high school	8	9	9
High school graduate	15	27	21
Business/trade school	7	9	9
Some college	19	14	15
Associate degree	5	4	9
Baccalaureate degree	12	14	13
Some graduate/professional school	6	5	8
Graduate/professional degree	13	11	12

Table 13. Parental Income (in percentages)

(N)	Winners (202)	Honorable Mentions (165)	Nonwinners (141)
Less than $10,000	9%	7%	6%
$10,000–$24,999	28	26	29
$25,000–$49,999	37	42	41
$50,000–$74,999	20	18	16
$75,000 or more	6	7	8

the other two groups (Table 13). About two-thirds of honorable mentions and nonwinners and slightly fewer winners (63 percent) are from families with incomes of $25,000 or more. About 9 percent of winners versus 7 percent of honorable mentions and 6 percent of nonwinners are from families with incomes of less than $10,000.

The median parental income for semifinalists is $30,000 and over, substantially above that of the total pool of Hispanic SAT-takers (Table 14), in which the median income for Mexican Americans is $19,900 and for mainland Puerto Ricans $15,600. Thus, it appears that this group of semifinalists is much better off financially than most other college-bound Hispanics who take the SAT and about as well off as the average white SAT-taker.

We asked students to indicate how many persons were dependent on the parental income, counting themselves and their parents if applicable (Table 15). The three groups are very similar. Semifinalists generally have four or five persons dependent on the parental income. The mean number of dependents for winners and honorable mentions is 4.7 versus 4.3 for nonwinners.

Summary

Most National Hispanic Semifinalists are from middle-class families as characterized by parental occupation, education, and income. This is consistent with the research, which indicates that Hispanic students of higher socioeconomic levels are more likely to do well in high school (Brown et al. 1980; Durán 1983; Ford Foundation 1984; HPDP 1984; Nielsen and Fernández 1981). Commonwealth Puerto Ricans in our sample tend to come from families with higher levels of education and income than do their mainland counterparts, a finding that is also consistent with research on Puerto Rican college-bound students (Kent 1982). Differences between the two groups constituting the Puerto Rican sample are analyzed in more detail in Appendix A.

Winners, as a group, are similar in socioeconomic backgrounds to honorable mentions and nonwinners. National Hispanic Scholars are selected for their ac-

Table 14. Parental Income of Semifinalists Compared with That of SAT-Takers

	Winners		Honorable Mentions		Nonwinners		SAT-Takers*		
(N)	MA† (160)	PR‡ (63)	MA (139)	PR (62)	MA (138)	PR (63)	MA	PR	White
Median Income	$32,653	$30,555	$35,000	$38,461	$30,000	$30,769	$19,900	$15,600	$32,900

*Source: Arbeiter. *Profiles, College-Bound Seniors, 1984.*
†Mexican American.
‡Puerto Rican.

Table 15. Number of Persons Dependent on Parental Income (in percentages)

(N)	Winners (208)	Honorable Mentions (170)	Nonwinners (145)
Two	5%	7%	7%
Three	17	16	13
Four	25	26	40
Five	25	23	23
Six	16	17	14
Seven	9	9	3
Eight	2	1	0
Nine or more	1	2	0

Table 16. First Language Spoken as a Child (in percentages)

(N)	Winners (208)	Honorable Mentions (170)	Nonwinners (145)
English	53%	56%	53%
Spanish	29	25	27
Both English and Spanish	15	19	20
Other	2	—	—

ademic achievement and leadership abilities, but their motivation and the barriers they overcome are also considered. Thus, some winners come from families that have lower levels of education and income.

Language Background

Language Use

The majority of Hispanic Semifinalists spoke English as their first language. Fifteen percent of winners, compared with 19 percent of honorable mentions and 20 percent of nonwinners, learned English and Spanish simultaneously as their native languages (Table 16).

Nearly all the students (80 percent and over) spoke English with their friends in high school. Thirteen percent of winners spoke both languages with their high school friends, compared with 9 percent of honorable mentions and 10 percent of nonwinners (Table 17).

Most semifinalists were from homes where English or both English and Spanish are spoken (Table 18). Thirty-nine percent of winners came from homes where English only is spoken, compared with 48 percent of honorable mentions and 46 percent of nonwinners. Fifteen percent of nonwinners came from homes where Spanish only is spoken, compared with 21 percent of honorable mentions and 18 percent of winners. Forty-three percent of winners came from homes where both languages are spoken, compared with 31 percent of honorable mentions and 38 percent of nonwinners. Thus, it appears that most of these high-achieving students came from homes where English is spoken, but a substantial portion were from bilingual homes, which produced more winners. In this respect semifinalists differ from other Hispanic college students, only 19 percent of whom came from homes where only English is spoken (Brown et al. 1980).

English and Spanish Proficiency

Students generally rate highly their command of English but give themselves slightly lower marks for writing than for understanding, speaking, and reading (Table 19). Nearly all rated themselves "extremely well" or "well." None rated themselves below "moderately well" except two winners (1.1 percent) who indicated they write English "not very well." Four winners (3 percent), six honorable mentions (4 percent), and six nonwinners (4 percent) rated themselves as writing English "moderately well." We believe this lower self-assessment of English writing proficiency reflects the students who learned Spanish as their first language and reside in the Commonwealth. It may also reflect differences in how students rate themselves. Nevertheless, our data indicate that semifinalists overall believe they have a good command of English.

As might be expected from the high proportion of students who indicated English was the first language they spoke as a child, students rated themselves lower in their command of Spanish; some students had no facility in the language at all (Table 20). Most, how-

Table 17. Language Spoken with High School Friends (in percentages)

(N)	Winners (208)	Honorable Mentions (170)	Nonwinners (145)
English	80%	85%	81%
Spanish	6	6	8
Both English and Spanish	13	9	10
Other	1	—	—

Table 18. Language Spoken in Home (in percentages)

(N)	Winners (208)	Honorable Mentions (170)	Nonwinners (145)
English	39%	48%	46%
Spanish	18	21	15
Both English and Spanish	43	31	38
Other	1	0	0

Table 19. Self-Assessment of English Proficiency (in percentages)

	Winners				*Honorable Mentions*			*Nonwinners*		
	Ext. Well	*Well*	*Mod. Well*	*Not Very Well*	*Ext. Well*	*Well*	*Mod. Well*	*Ext. Well*	*Well*	*Mod. Well*
Understand spoken English	96%	4%	—	—	97%	2%	1%	95%	6%	—
Speak English	88	9	2%	—	90	9	1	90	7	3%
Read English	96	4	1	—	95	5	—	96	4	—
Write English	83	13	3	1%	85	12	4	90	6	4

Table 20. Self-Assessment of Spanish Proficiency (in percentages)

	Winners					*Honorable Mentions*					*Nonwinners*				
	Ext. Well	*Well*	*Mod. Well*	*Not Very Well*	*Not at All*	*Ext. Well*	*Well*	*Mod. Well*	*Not Very Well*	*Not at All*	*Ext. Well*	*Well*	*Mod. Well*	*Not Very Well*	*Not at All*
Understand spoken Spanish	34%	25%	27%	11%	3%	26%	21%	30%	15%	8%	29%	25%	25%	18%	3%
Speak Spanish	17	19	33	27	6	16	16	28	27	14	18	17	26	32	7
Read Spanish	18	28	32	14	7	17	22	31	19	11	21	20	30	17	12
Write Spanish	14	19	34	21	13	12	18	23	27	21	17	12	24	30	16

Table 21. English as Best Language (in percentages)

	Winners			*Honorable Mentions*			*Nonwinners*			*SAT-Takers**	
	MA	*PR*	*Other*	*MA*	*PR*	*Other*	*MA*	*PR*	*Other*	*MA*	*PR*
(N)	*(160)*	*(65)*	*(6)*	*(143)*	*(63)*	*(9)*	*(138)*	*(65)*	*(24)*		
Yes	99%	75%	—	99%	78%	100%	99%	62%	92%	92%	90%
No	1	25	100%	—	22	—	—	38	8	8	10

**Source:* Arbeiter. *Profiles, College-Bound Seniors, 1984.*

ever, can understand, speak, read, and write Spanish with some fluency. Overall, the groups are similar in their Spanish proficiency.

English as Best Language

Nearly all the Mexican Americans indicated that English is their best language (Table 21), with a higher proportion of Hispanic Semifinalists so reporting than the pool of Mexican American SAT-takers (99 percent versus 92 percent). There are no differences among Mexican American winners, honorable mentions, and nonwinners. A smaller percentage of Puerto Ricans, compared with Mexican Americans, indicated that English is their best language; 75 percent of winners, 78 percent of honorable mentions, and 62 percent of nonwinners reported that English is their best language compared with 90 percent of all Puerto Rican SAT-takers. We believe that one reason for this outcome is that the Hispanic Semifinalist sample includes both mainland and Commonwealth Puerto Ricans, while the SAT sample includes only mainland Puerto Ricans.

Summary

It appears that most National Hispanic Semifinalists have a good command of English. Most are from homes where English or both English and Spanish are spoken. Most have some facility in Spanish as well as in English, but they appear to be in the mainstream in English use and fluency. Research on the effect of language proficiency on achievement, while acknowledging that proficiency in English is an important predictor of educational achievement, also associates proficiency in both English and Spanish with higher achievement levels (Durán 1983; Nielsen 1986; Nielsen and Fernández 1981).

High School Preparation

This section provides information about students' educational backgrounds and high school programs. Where comparable data exist for Puerto Rican and Mexican American SAT-takers as a group, we have broken down the data on Hispanic Semifinalists by Mexican American, mainland Puerto Rican, and Commonwealth Puerto Rican. This provides a profile of semifinalists compared with the pool of college-bound Hispanic students. We have also included comparable data for white SAT-takers.

Type of High School

Although the majority of semifinalists attended public high schools, a substantial proportion attended nonpublic schools (Table 22). Twenty-one percent of the Mexican American winners and 19 percent of the Mexican American honorable mentions attended nonpublic schools. This is in line with all Mexican American SAT-takers. Thirty percent of the Mexican American nonwinners attended nonpublic schools.

A much larger portion of Puerto Ricans attended nonpublic schools — 46 percent of winners, 41 percent of honorable mentions, and 59 percent of nonwinners compared with 23 percent of all Puerto Rican SAT-takers. It should be noted that our sample of Puerto Rican semifinalists includes Commonwealth Puerto Ricans, the majority of whom attended private high schools; the PSAT/NMSQT is given in very few public schools in Puerto Rico.

High School Program

Nearly all semifinalists were in an academic, or a college preparatory, program in high school; winners and honorable mentions were slightly more likely to have been in such a program than were nonwinners. The proportion of Mexican American and Puerto Rican semifinalists pursuing an academic course of study is substantially above the proportion of the pool of SAT-takers for those two ethnic groups and somewhat above that of white SAT-takers as well (Table 22).

The high school program students choose is an important factor in their college entrance. Not only are students in a college preparatory track more likely to go to college, but the quality of courses is often substantially better and therefore provides students with a better background for college entrance (Ballesteros 1986; Rosenbaum 1976; Santos 1986). Thus, it is not surprising that most Hispanic Semifinalists have been in a college preparatory program. They are different from other Hispanic high school seniors, who have generally enrolled in college preparatory programs at a much lower rate (25 percent, Orum 1986).

Proportion of Hispanics in High School

We were also interested in the degree to which Hispanic students are educated in integrated school settings. The majority (over two-thirds) of all Hispanics attend schools where over half the students are minorities (Orfield 1987; Orum 1986). In contrast, more than three-fourths of the Hispanic Semifinalists attended high schools where fewer than 50 percent of their classmates were Hispanics. Higher achievement rates and college participation rates are related to attendance at primarily white schools (Mahard 1978). A substantial number of semifinalists attended a high school with fewer than 10 percent Hispanic students, and only about 20 percent attended a high school with more than 50 percent Hispanics. The three groups in Table 23 look similar in the proportion of Hispanics in their high school, although a slightly smaller proportion of nonwinners attended high schools with fewer Hispanic students.

Table 22. Type of High School and Program (in percentages)

	Winners			*Honorable Mentions*			*Nonwinners*			*SAT-Takers*		
	MA	*PR*	*Other*	*MA*	*PR*	*Other*	*MA*	*PR*	*Other*	*MA*	*PR*	*White*
(N)	*(160)*	*(65)*	*(6)*	*(143)*	*(63)*	*(9)*	*(138)*	*(65)*	*(24)*			
Type of high school												
Public	79%	54%	50%	81%	59%	78%	69%	42%	67%	80%	77%	80%
Nonpublic	21	46	50	19	41	22	30	59	33	20	23	20
High school program												
Academic/college preparatory	96	97	100	95	97	100	91	91	92	68	64	80
General	4	2	0	4	2	0	5	8	4	22	18	13
Career-oriented	0	0	0	1	2	0	1	0	4	9	17	6
Other	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0

**Source:* Arbeiter. *Profiles, College-Bound Seniors, 1984.*
Note: Totals may not equal 100% because of rounding.

Table 23. Proportion of Hispanic Students in High School

(N)	Winners (211)	Honorable Mentions (169)	Nonwinners (148)
Less than 10%	43%	43%	39%
10%–49%	33	40	38
50% or more	24	17	24

Table 24. Hispanic Teachers and Guidance Counselors in High School (in percentages)

(N)	Winners (209)	Honorable Mentions (169)	Nonwinners (148)
Teachers			
None	27%	32%	22%
1–2	39	37	34
3–4	17	13	18
5 or more	17	18	26
Guidance counselors	25	23	30

Hispanic Teachers and Guidance Counselors

Role models are important to students' educational career choices, so we were interested in the extent of their association with Hispanic teachers and guidance counselors. Most semifinalists had at least one Hispanic teacher, but many did not; 27 percent of winners, 32 percent of honorable mentions, and 22 percent of nonwinners had no Hispanic teachers. Seventeen percent of winners, 18 percent of honorable mentions, and 26 percent of nonwinners had five or more (Table 24).

Some students had a Hispanic guidance counselor—25 percent of winners, 23 percent of honorable mentions, and 30 percent of nonwinners (Table 24).

Counseling in High School

Most students received academic counseling (65 percent of winners, 68 percent of honorable mentions, and 71 percent of nonwinners) and advice on college selection (69 percent of winners, 74 percent of honorable mentions, and 70 percent of nonwinners). Over half received financial aid counseling. Fewer than half the winners (47 percent), 55 percent of honorable mentions, and 50 percent of nonwinners received career counseling (Table 25).

Of those who received guidance in high school, most semifinalists (over 80 percent) received counseling from a guidance counselor, but a substantial portion received counseling from a teacher—48 percent of winners, 45 percent of honorable mentions, and 37 percent of nonwinners. A small proportion of students received counseling from someone outside school (16 percent of winners, 15 percent of honorable mentions, and 10 percent of nonwinners) (Table 26).

Earlier studies have indicated the importance for minority students of role models and of encouragement from individuals in their lives (Blackwell 1981; HPDP 1984; Payán, Peterson, and Castille 1984; Pearson 1984), so we asked these students if there had been a particular person who encouraged them in their academic careers. Most indicated they had such a person—73 percent of winners, 68 percent of honorable mentions, and 62 percent of nonwinners. Parents (about 60 percent of each group) were named most frequently, followed by teachers, with winners most likely to name a teacher as the role model (23 percent of winners, 14 percent of honorable mentions, and 17 percent of nonwinners) (Table 27).

A majority of students indicated the person who encouraged them was Hispanic—65 percent of winners, 68 percent of honorable mentions, and 65 percent of nonwinners.

Attendance at Schools outside United States

Most semifinalists attended high school in the continental United States, although about 17 to 18 percent of each group said they attended school outside (Table 28). For most of these students the predominant language of the school was Spanish, but some attended schools where the predominant language was English or another language. These are United States citizens who reside in a foreign country, whose family may be in the military or diplomatic service.

Table 25. Counseling in High School (in percentages)

(N)	Winners (208)	Honorable Mentions (171)	Nonwinners (144)
Academic counseling	65%	68%	71%
Career planning	47	55	50
College selection	69	74	70
Financial aid	58	59	51
Personal counseling	21	25	22

Table 26. Provider of Counseling (in percentages)

(N)	Winners (211)	Honorable Mentions (172)	Nonwinners (148)
Guidance counselor	84%	85%	86%
Teacher	48	45	37
Someone else at school	10	11	12
Someone outside school	16	15	10

Academic Subjects Taken

All semifinalists took more years of academic subjects than all Hispanic SAT-takers or white SAT-takers did (Table 29). This is consistent with the higher proportion of Hispanic Semifinalists who were in a college preparatory track. Most semifinalists had four or more years of English; Mexican American winners and honorable mentions were more likely than Puerto Rican winners and honorable mentions to have taken more than four years of English. Semifinalists studied slightly more years of English than did the comparable groups of SAT-takers.

Many semifinalists took four or more years of mathematics. They chose substantially more mathematics than did Hispanic or white SAT-takers as a group. Only 9 percent of all Mexican American, 8 percent of Puerto Rican, and 13 percent of white SAT-takers took more than four years of mathematics, compared with 30 percent of the Mexican American winners and 34 percent of the Puerto Rican winners. Twenty-two percent of Mexican American honorable mentions and nonwinners took more than four years; 27 percent of Puerto Rican honorable mentions and 15 percent of nonwinners did so.

Most semifinalists had two or more years of a foreign language. About 89 percent of Mexican American winners versus 84 percent of honorable mentions and 82 percent of nonwinners took two or more years of a foreign language. This compares with 69 percent of all Mexican American SAT-takers. Among Puerto Ricans, 95 percent of all categories—winners, honorable mentions, and nonwinners—took two or more years of a foreign language compared with 76 percent of all Puerto Rican SAT-takers. (Seventy-six percent of white SAT-takers had two or more years of a foreign language.)

Most Hispanic Semifinalists studied science (94 percent and over of all groups), which was in line with all SAT-takers. Winners and honorable mentions were similar: about 79 percent of Mexican American and 88 percent of Puerto Rican winners had two or more years of physical science, while 73 percent and 85 percent of nonwinners, respectively, took this amount.

All semifinalists studied social studies, and a substantial proportion had four or more years. Among winners, 34 percent of Mexican Americans, 60 percent of Puerto Ricans, and 50 percent of other Hispanics took four or more years of social studies. Among honorable mentions, 36 percent of Mexican Americans, 52 percent of Puerto Ricans, and 44 percent of other Hispanics took four or more years of social studies. This compares with 27 percent of Mexican American SAT-takers, 41 percent of Puerto Rican SAT-takers, and 41 percent of white SAT-takers.

Because so many careers depend on a solid background in mathematics and science, it is important that students stay in this education pipeline. One reason often cited for the underrepresentation of minorities in medicine and technical areas has been their attrition from these subjects in high school. Among the semifinalists, that does not seem to be the case.

Table 27. Person Who Encouraged Student in Academic Career (in percentages)

	Winners	*Honorable Mentions*	*Nonwinners*
Person available who encouraged student	73%	68%	62%
Relationship of that person			
Parent	59	60	66
Sibling	3	7	2
Another family member	2	—	3
Teacher	23	14	17
Counselor	8	11	9
Other person at school	1	2	1
Clergy	1	—	1
Other	3	6	1
(N)	(123)	(106)	(71)
Hispanic background of that person	65%	68%	65%
(N)	(154)	(122)	(89)

Table 28. School Attendance outside United States

	Winners (N)			*Honorable Mentions (N)*			*Nonwinners (N)*		
School attendance outside continental U.S.*	*N* = 36 (17%)			*N* = 30 (18%)			*N* = 26 (18%)		
Language of school	Eng.	Sp.	Other	Eng.	Sp.	Other	Eng.	Sp.	Other
Number responding	9	23	4	7	21	2	7	17	2

*Includes both Commonwealth Puerto Ricans and students who are U.S. citizens but are attending schools in another country because their families are living there.

Table 29. Number of Years of Academic Study by Subject (in percentages)

	Winners			*Honorable Mentions*			*Nonwinners*			*SAT-Takers**		
	MA	*PR*	*Other*	*MA*	*PR*	*Other*	*MA*	*PR*	*Other*	*MA*	*PR*	*White*
(N)	*(160)*	*(65)*	*(6)*	*(143)*	*(63)*	*(9)*	*(138)*	*(65)*	*(24)*			
English												
1 yr	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	11%	0%	0%	0%	1%	2%	1%
2 yr	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	2	1
3 yr	3	2	0	2	0	0	1	2	4	7	6	4
4 yr	81	95	83	84	97	78	88	94	71	82	83	85
4+ yr	14	3	17	14	3	11	7	5	21	8	7	10
None	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mathematics												
1 yr	0	0	0	0	0	11	0	2	0	2	3	1
2 yr	2	0	0	1	0	0	2	2	0	15	17	8
3 yr	6	5	0	10	13	0	17	11	13	30	29	24
4 yr	62	62	50	66	60	44	57	71	63	44	43	54
4+ yr	30	34	50	22	27	44	22	15	25	9	8	13
None	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Foreign language												
1 yr	8	3	0	7	2	11	8	3	4	18	14	12
2 yr	44	15	50	36	25	0	38	15	33	41	31	35
3 yr	23	28	17	20	22	56	26	26	25	17	25	22
4 yr	16	32	33	22	38	11	9	40	29	9	16	15
4+ yr	6	20	0	6	10	22	9	14	4	2	4	4
None	3	2	0	10	3	0	7	2	0	13	11	12
Biological science												
1 yr	61	65	33	59	62	44	66	74	58	64	59	62
2 yr	31	29	67	33	27	33	26	22	29	25	25	27
3 yr	3	5	0	3	6	22	2	2	4	4	6	5
4 yr	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	8	1	2	2
4+ yr	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	1	1
None	5	0	0	6	3	0	4	2	0	5	7	4
Physical science												
1 yr	17	12	0	15	13	22	21	15	17	42	38	30
2 yr	44	35	50	50	44	67	41	45	50	31	32	37
3 yr	26	39	33	27	37	11	28	37	21	11	15	21
4 yr	6	11	0	4	5	0	3	3	8	2	4	4
4+ yr	3	3	17	1	2	0	1	0	4	1	1	1
None	3	0	0	2	0	0	4	0	0	13	11	7
Social studies												
1 yr	1	0	0	1	0	11	1	2	0	2	3	2
2 yr	16	8	0	9	8	22	10	11	8	16	16	16
3 yr	49	33	50	54	40	22	60	34	46	54	39	42
4 yr	33	44	33	31	46	44	27	46	38	24	36	35
4+ yr	1	16	17	5	6	0	1	8	8	3	5	6
None	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0

Source: Arbeiter. *Profiles, College-Bound Seniors, 1984.*
Note: Totals may not equal 100% because of rounding.

These students took a substantial amount of mathematics and science. Thus, it appears this group entered college with broad options as to course of study and career. Once students switch out of the technical areas, they are unlikely to switch back (Berryman 1983).

Advanced/Honors Courses

A substantial portion of Hispanic Program Candidates took honors or advanced courses in high school, as did nonapplicants (Table 30). (As indicated early in this report, nonapplicants are students who were iden-

Table 30. Proportion Taking Advanced Courses (in percentages)

	Winners	*Honorable Mentions*	*Non-winners*	*Non-applicants*
English	57%	52%	38%	43%
Mathematics	55	47	37	42
Foreign language	26	23	20	17
Biological science	36	27	25	25
Physical science	37	27	25	27
Social studies	41	36	29	27

tified as eligible candidates but chose not to apply.) Over half the winners took advanced English (57 percent) or mathematics (55 percent). Among the honorable mentions, the proportions taking advanced English and mathematics were 52 percent and 47 percent, respectively. Twenty-six percent of the winners, 23 percent of the honorable mentions, and 20 percent of the nonwinners took advanced courses in foreign language. More than one-third of the winners and about 27 percent of the honorable mentions took advanced courses in science.

Many of these students planned to apply for college credit for the advanced work; the proportions are similar to the proportions of students completing advanced work in the subjects. The largest numbers of applicants planned to apply for credit in English (57 percent of winners, 51 percent of honorable mentions, and 42 percent of nonwinners) and mathematics (53 percent of winners, 49 percent of honorable mentions, and 35 percent of nonwinners) (Table 31). Many nonapplicants also sought college credit in these areas (40 percent in English and 38 percent in mathematics).

These data indicate that many of the Hispanic Program Candidates were exposed to advanced courses in English and mathematics and planned to request exemption from some freshman courses. A substantial number also took advanced courses in scientific areas: 22 percent of the winners and 19 percent of the honorable mentions and nonwinners planned to apply for credit in the physical sciences; 17 percent of winners, 13 percent of honorable mentions, and 11 percent of nonwinners planned to apply for credit in the biological sciences. Twenty-nine percent of winners and 23 percent of honorable mentions and nonwinners planned to apply for college credit in social studies. Very few students (4 percent of winners, 3 percent of honorable mentions, and 2 percent of nonwinners) planned to apply for college credit in art or music.

We believe this level of completion of college-level work is quite an accomplishment, although we do not know how this compares with the coursework of high-achieving non-Hispanics.

High School Honors

Most National Hispanic Program Candidates received awards or honors in high school (Table 32). Ninety-five percent of the winners received at least one award compared with 84 percent of honorable mentions and 83 percent of nonwinners. Over one-third (36 percent) of the winners received seven or more honors compared with 19 percent of honorable mentions and 13 percent of nonwinners.

Academic Ability

For all categories, both Puerto Rican and Mexican American Program Candidates show high school grade point averages (GPAs) and test scores above the mean for their respective ethnic groups and above the mean for the white group (Table 33). This indicates a high level of academic achievement among the National Hispanic Semifinalists, which will be discussed in more detail in the section on Predicting First-Year Performance, p. 36.

Puerto Ricans and Mexican Americans are similar in reported GPAs of winners and honorable mentions. The mean SAT scores for Mexican American winners are 575 verbal and 630 mathematical; for Puerto Rican winners they are 566 verbal and 623 mathematical. For Mexican American honorable mentions the scores are 549 verbal and 607 mathematical; for Puerto Ricans they are 546 verbal and 604 mathematical. For all groups, the mathematical score is greater than the verbal; this is true for the total pools of Hispanic SAT-

Table 31. Proportion Planning to Apply for College Credit (in percentages)

	Winners	*Honorable Mentions*	*Non-winners*	*Non-applicants*
English	57%	51%	42%	40%
Mathematics	53	49	35	38
Foreign language	29	32	25	26
Biological science	17	13	11	12
Physical science	22	19	19	18
Social studies	29	23	23	20
Art/music	4	3	2	4

Table 32. High School Honors or Awards (in percentages)

	Winners	*Honorable Mentions*	*Non-winners*	*Non-applicants*
0	5%	16%	18%	17%
1–2	22	26	35	29
3–4	22	27	23	23
5–6	15	12	12	12
7+	36	19	13	19

Table 33. Mean High School GPA, SAT Scores, and Achievement Test Scores

Puerto Rican

	Winners			*Honorable Mentions*			*Nonwinners*			*Nonapplicants**			*College-Bound PR SAT-Takers†*	
	Score	*SD*	*N*	*Score*	*SD*	*N*	*Score*	*SD*	*N*	*Score*	*SD*	*N*	*Score*	*SD*
HSGPA‡	3.76	.31	63	3.59	.39	62	3.42	.41	62	3.37	.54	142	2.87	
SAT-V	566	65.0	65	546	74.9	63	519	69.9	65	555	74.8	141	366	107
SAT-M	623	69.8	65	604	68.6	63	563	80.2	65	592	73.4	141	400	109
English	553	85.2	48	528	72.9	41	514	66.6	39	—	—	—	472	101
Math. I	600	59.6	35	580	60.7	71	585	67.0	27	—	—	—	510	93
Math. II	693	70.4	11	663	91.7	80	625	75.3	6	—	—	—	621	104
Spanish	703	102.5	32	660	119.4	78	730	94.3	25	—	—	—	633	111

Mexican American

	Winners			*Honorable Mentions*			*Nonwinners*			*Nonapplicants**			*College-Bound MA SAT-Takers†*	
	Score	*SD*	*N*	*Score*	*SD*	*N*	*Score*	*SD*	*N*	*Score*	*SD*	*N*	*Score*	*SD*
HSGPA	3.78	.29	160	3.61	.34	143	3.33	.47	135	3.43	.55	341	2.97	
SAT-V	575	76.4	159	549	71.6	142	534	80.8	138	545	82.1	339	376	100
SAT-M	630	61.9	159	607	68.1	142	582	72.6	138	593	78.9	339	420	106
English	569	74.6	111	559	63.9	82	532	80.4	81	—	—	—	457	95
Math. I	613	65.5	72	579	82.1	56	551	66.4	61	—	—	—	486	89
Math. II	683	70.7	34	667	53.3	28	622	94.6	17	—	—	—	603	105
Spanish	621	121.9	29	622	108.1	28	603	121.8	25	—	—	—	624	117

Other Hispanic

	Winners			*Honorable Mentions*			*Nonwinners*			*Nonapplicants*		
	Score	*SD*	*N*	*Score*	*SD*	*N*	*Score*	*SD*	*N*	*Score*	*SD*	*N*
HSGPA	3.68	.38	6	3.45	.43	9	3.47	.47	24	3.37	.53	48
SAT-V	593	92.6	6	552	56.3	9	577	59.1	23	577	75.8	48
SAT-M	625	65.0	6	580	58.1	9	608	50.2	24	586	80.3	48

White

	College-Bound SAT-Takers†	
	Score	*SD*
HSGPA	3.07	
SAT-V	445	103
SAT-M	487	114
English	530	98
Math. I	546	90
Math. II	661	89
Spanish	509	105

*Achievement Test data not reported for nonapplicants because of small numbers.

†*Source:* Arbeiter. *Profiles, College-Bound Seniors, 1984.*

‡High school grade point average.

takers as well as the white pool. The "Other Hispanic" pool is too small to report.

Nonapplicants also show test scores and GPAs above the mean for college-bound seniors. This indicates that there are very able students among the nonapplicants who might be very competitive in this program.

The most usual Achievement Tests taken were the English Composition Test, the Level I Mathematics Test, the Level II Mathematics Test, and the Span-

Table 34. Self-Ratings of Academic Abilities (in percentages)

	Winners		*Honorable Mentions*		*Nonwinners*		*Nonapplicants*	
	Top 1%	*Top 10%*	*Top 1%*	*Top 10%*	*Top 1%*	*Top 10 %*	*Top 1%*	*Top 10 %*
Creative writing	13%	34%	15%	31%	11%	27%	11%	29%
Mathematics	38	38	32	38	20	36	21	43
Science	19	38	17	37	11	32	13	33
Music	10	17	9	22	8	16	8	15
Art	5	14	5	20	3	15	4	16
Spoken expression	23	29	19	29	15	30	17	28
Written expression	20	39	24	32	17	33	17	34

ish Test. Again, National Hispanic Semifinalists scored well above the mean for their respective ethnic groups, except for the Mexican Americans who took the Spanish Test.

Self-Rating of Academic Ability

Program Candidates overall rate themselves very high on mathematical and scientific ability and written expression. The lowest ratings are in artistic and musical ability (Table 34). This is consistent with the high numbers of students planning majors in engineering, computer science, or science-related fields and the low numbers in arts and humanities.

High School Activities

Generally, students in a college preparatory, or an academic, track are more involved in school activities and exercise more leadership positions than do those in other tracks (Rosenbaum 1976). Among Hispanic Program Candidates there is a high level of participation in community, athletic, and school activities.

Table 35 shows that winners, honorable mentions, and nonwinners were similar in their participation in community and religious groups, but winners held more offices in high school clubs and organizations. This higher rate of office holding reflects leadership ability, which is among the criteria for selecting candidates.

The most active students were in at least two activities (63 percent of winners, 59 percent of honorable mentions, and 60 percent of nonwinners). About 20 percent of the National Hispanic Semifinalists in all award categories held a major office. Winners held more offices in clubs or organizations in high school than did the other two groups—33 percent of the winners held three or more offices compared with 18 percent of honorable mentions and 18 percent of nonwinners.

Most Hispanic Program Candidates were engaged in athletics, and many (34 percent of winners, 26 percent of honorable mentions, 32 percent of nonwinners, and 33 percent of nonapplicants) earned at least one varsity letter.

Table 35. Level of Participation in High School Activities (in percentages)

	Winners	*Honorable Mentions*	*Non-winners*	*Non-applicants*
Community/religious group				
None	19%	20%	21%	27%
1–2 groups/not active	18	20	19	18
Active 2 groups	32	30	30	29
Active 2+ groups	11	10	11	9
Major office	20	19	19	17
Athletics				
None	25	30	22	28
Individual/intramural	32	29	34	30
Varsity sport	10	15	12	10
1 varsity letter	25	13	21	20
2 or more letters	9	13	11	13
High school clubs and organizations				
None	1	4	6	7
Belong/no office	31	48	49	43
1–2 offices	35	30	28	31
3–4 offices	20	13	12	15
5 or more offices	13	5	6	5

Table 36 shows the type of activities in which program candidates participated. Forty-nine percent of winners, 34 percent of honorable mentions, and 31 percent each of nonwinners and nonapplicants took part in student government. Over half the winners and honorable mentions were involved in social clubs or community organizations, and nearly half the winners, 40 percent of the honorable mentions, and 36 percent of the nonwinners participated in journalism activities. Over 40 percent of the winners and 40 percent of the honorable mentions were active in art, music, or dance activities.

Very few Hispanic Program Candidates joined ethnic or racial organizations or preprofessional clubs, although 19 percent of winners participated in ethnic

Table 36. Type of High School Activities (in percentages)

	Winners	*Honorable Mentions*	*Non-winners*	*Non-applicants*
Ethnic/racial organizations	19%	16%	15%	15%
Journalism	49	40	36	36
Art/music/dance	44	40	36	36
Preprofessional clubs	21	20	15	17
Religious activities	42	42	37	33
Social clubs/community organizations	55	56	37	33
Student government	49	34	31	31

organizations, as did 16 percent of honorable mentions and 15 percent of nonwinners and nonapplicants. Preprofessional clubs were joined by 21 percent of winners, 20 percent of honorable mentions, 15 percent of nonwinners, and 17 percent of nonapplicants.

The candidates showed a relatively high rate of involvement in religious activities, with 42 percent of the winners and honorable mentions participating compared with 37 percent of the nonwinners and 33 percent of the nonapplicants. This may reflect the religious tradition often found in Hispanic families.

From these data it appears that Hispanic Program Candidates were very involved in extracurricular activities and took many positions of leadership. These students were well integrated into the mainstream of their high schools. Winners showed the greatest degree of leadership. Social clubs and community organizations, journalism, and student government were the most usual activities. Few students participated in ethnic activities.

Special High School Activities

We asked these students about their participation in special activities for all talented students and for Hispanic students in particular and about any special preparation for standardized tests (Table 37).

Generally, the level of participation in these activities was low, and the differences among winners, honorable mentions, and nonwinners are trivial. Four percent of winners, 2 percent of honorable mentions, and 4 percent of nonwinners participated in Upward Bound. About 3 percent of the winners were involved in A Better Chance, compared with 1 percent of the honorable mentions and 1 percent of the nonwinners. The same proportion (8 percent) of all groups participated in Talent Search. About 3 percent of winners, 1 percent of honorable mentions, and 2 percent of nonwinners took part in Aspira. Thus, it appears that few were in activities aimed at Hispanics or minorities. About 8 percent of winners and honorable mentions and 7 percent of nonwinners attended a special high school.

Twenty-five percent of winners, 28 percent of honorable mentions, and 18 percent of nonwinners had special preparation for SAT or ACT. About 14 percent of winners, 13 percent of honorable mentions, and 7 percent of nonwinners had special preparation for Achievement Tests.

Bilingual Programs in High School

Few Hispanic Semifinalists took high school courses for non-English-speaking students (Table 38). This finding is consistent with their high self-assessment of English proficiency (Table 19) and the high proportion from homes where English is spoken (Table 18). Only a relatively small proportion took courses in Hispanic history and culture. It appears, therefore, that most students were integrated into the regular high school program, with little special attention given to their Hispanic language backgrounds.

Table 37. Special High School Activities (in percentages)

(N)	*Winners (204)*	*Honorable Mentions (167)*	*Nonwinners (136)*
Cooperative Education	4%	6%	6%
Work-Study	5	5	7
Talent Search	8	8	8
Upward Bound	4	2	4
A Better Chance	3	1	1
Aspira	3	1	2
Special high school	8	8	7
Special preparation ACT/SAT	25	28	18
Special preparation Achievement Tests	14	13	7

Table 38. Participation in Bilingual/Bicultural Programs (in percentages)

(N)	*Winners (203)*	*Honorable Mentions (152)*	*Nonwinners (142)*
Bilingual/bicultural programs	11%	8%	13%
English for students from non-English-speaking homes	4	5	8
Reading and writing in first language (other than English)	16	13	16
Other subject matter taught in non-English language	10	9	10
History and culture of student's ancestors or their life in U.S.	16	16	18

Part-Time Work in High School

About half the winners (50 percent) held a part-time job while in high school compared with 53 percent of the honorable mentions and 56 percent of the nonwinners. Winners worked, on average, 12.2 hours per week, honorable mentions 14.1 hours, and nonwinners 14.1 hours (Table 39). The mean hours worked by Mexican Americans and Puerto Ricans who held jobs are shown in Table 40.

We also computed mean hours of part-time work for each semifinalist group, including those who did not work, in order to compare the results with the hours worked by Mexican American, Puerto Rican, and white SAT-takers (Table 41).

Summary

It is evident that these high-achieving Hispanic students were in the mainstream of both academic and extracurricular activities at their high schools. They showed relatively low levels of participation in special programs for highly talented Hispanic students and in bilingual or bicultural programs.

These Hispanic students rated themselves highly on their command of English, and few took any special courses for non-English-speaking students. Most attended high schools with only a small proportion of Hispanic students, and most had at least one Hispanic teacher. Nearly all were enrolled in an academic, or a college preparatory, track. Most students received academic, financial aid, and college-selection counseling, usually from a guidance counselor. About half the students held part-time jobs while in high school.

Table 39. Part-Time Work (in percentages)

Hours per Week	*Winners*	*Honorable Mentions*	*Nonwinners*
None	49%	46%	44%
Fewer than 6	13	12	12
6–10	9	9	8
11–15	12	6	12
16–20	9	17	16
21–25	4	5	6
26–30	2	3	2
More than 30	1	1	—
Mean hours of those who worked	12.2 h	14.1 h	14.1 h

A majority of the students had a person who encouraged them in their academic career—usually a parent or a teacher.

The students in this sample took substantially more mathematics and science in high school than did the overall pool of college-bound Hispanic SAT-takers and somewhat more than whites. A substantial number of the respondents had honors or advanced courses in high school.

In all categories, both Puerto Ricans and Mexican Americans showed high school GPAs and test scores substantially above the mean for their respective ethnic groups. Winners had the highest GPAs and test scores, generally followed by honorable mentions. This is an indication that the selection criteria used by the NHSAP facilitate choosing the most academically able applicants.

College Selection

This section describes the factors affecting students' college choice, their application strategies, the colleges they attended, their intended areas of study, and their educational aspirations.

Choosing a College

We asked students to indicate the importance of various factors in choosing a college (Table 42). The most important considerations for all groups were academic reputation and available majors. Financial aid and cost were also very important to a large proportion of students.

Setting, size, distance from family home, and social atmosphere were moderately important. Friends going there and other Hispanic students on campus were not major concerns.

Thus, in choosing a college, these high-ability students were most concerned about the academic quality and programs of the colleges, followed by the availability of financial aid.

Table 40. Part-Time Work by Subgroup Who Held Jobs

	Winners		*Honorable Mentions*		*Nonwinners*	
	MA	*PR (mainland)*	*MA*	*PR (mainland)*	*MA*	*PR (mainland)*
Mean hours per week	12.5 h	11.0 h	14.3 h	13.6 h	16.3 h	12.3 h
Number of students	68	30	56	22	49	15

Table 41. Mean Hours per Week of Part-Time Work, Including Nonworkers

Workers and Nonworkers	*Mexican American*	*Puerto Rican (mainland)*	*White*
Winners	6.02 h	6.50 h	
Honorable mentions	7.14	6.40	
Nonwinners	8.50	6.80	
Hispanic SAT-takers*	6.90	7.40	
White SAT-takers*			7.70 h

**Source:* Arbeiter. *Profiles, College-Bound Seniors, 1984.*

Table 42. "Very Important" Factors Affecting College Choice (in percentages)

(N)	*Winners (209)*	*Honorable Mentions (171)*	*Nonwinners (147)*
Academic reputation	85%	77%	73%
Available majors	67	75	71
Financial aid	63	51	42
Cost	43	39	46
Setting	38	38	35
Size	21	17	20
Distance from home	27	23	27
Social atmosphere	20	23	21
Know people there	4	5	3
Friends going there	2	5	3
Other Hispanic students	2	2	3
Sports	4	5	6

Application to College

The mean number of applications for winners was 3.3 versus 2.6 for honorable mentions and 2.8 for nonwinners (Table 43).

Colleges Attended

We were able to obtain information on colleges attended from only a portion of the sample—73 percent of winners, 68 percent of honorable mentions, and 53 percent of nonwinners. Of respondents, 87 percent of winners, 99 percent of honorable mentions, and 96 percent of nonwinners supplied this information. From responses, it is clear that this group of students attends very selective colleges (see Table 45 for the list of institutions). Fifty-three percent of winners are enrolled in private colleges, compared with 37 percent of honorable mentions and 28 percent of nonwinners (Table 44). Very few students attend two-year colleges. The National Hispanic Scholar Awards Program is now limited to students who plan to enroll in four-year colleges.

There are 174 different institutions represented among the Hispanic semifinalists. In Table 45 the institutions with at least four semifinalists are listed. Most of the colleges with four or more semifinalists enrolled are very prestigious and have larger numbers of winners than honorable mentions or nonwinners. The most popular are Harvard/Radcliffe, Stanford, and the University of Texas at Austin, with 16 winners each.

Intended Majors

The intended majors for the Hispanic Semifinalists are listed in Table 46. The largest proportion of the semifinalists planned to major in engineering: about 30 percent of Mexican American winners and honorable mentions and 25 percent of nonwinners compared with about 22 percent of Puerto Rican winners and honorable mentions and 14 percent of nonwinners. The proportion of Hispanic Semifinalists selecting engineering is substantially above that for Hispanic SAT-takers (13 percent of Mexican Americans and 9 percent of Puerto Ricans) and for white SAT-takers (12 percent). Computer science was also favored, especially by Puerto Ricans; 16 percent of winners, 13 percent of honorable mentions, and 18 percent of nonwinners planned to major in computer science compared with 14 percent of all Puerto Rican SAT-takers. Among Mexican Americans the proportions planning to major in computer science were 10 percent of winners, 7 percent of honorable mentions, and 8 percent of nonwinners compared with 11 percent of all Mexican American SAT-takers. Among Mexican Americans 3 percent of winners, 2 percent of honorable mentions, and 4 percent of nonwinners planned to major in physical science, compared with 1 percent of Mexican American SAT-takers. For Puerto Ricans the proportions planning to major in physical science were 3 percent of winners, 2 percent of honorable mentions,

Table 43. Application to College

	Winners	*Honorable Mentions*	*Nonwinners*
Mean number of applications	3.3	2.6	2.8
Mean number of acceptances	3.1	2.4	2.4

Table 44. Type of College Attended (in percentages)

(N)	*Winners (182)*	*Honorable Mentions (163)*	*Nonwinners (130)*
Four-year college			
Private	53%	37%	28%
Public	44	61	67
U.S. Military Academy	1	1	1
Two-year college	2	1	4

Table 45. Institutions Attended by Hispanic Semifinalists

	Winners		*Honorable Mentions*		*Non-winners*	
	N	*%*	*N*	*%*	*N*	*%*
Boston College	0	—	1	—	4	2
Brown University	4	2	2	1	2	1
Columbia University	1	—	3	1	0	0
City University of New York	3	1	0	—	2	1
Duke University	4	2	1	—	0	0
Georgia Institute of Technology	0	—	1	—	4	2
Harvard/Radcliffe	16	6	4	2	2	1
Indiana University	0	—	3	1	1	—
Massachusetts Institute of Technology	6	2	3	1	0	0
Princeton Universitiy	11	4	3	1	1	—
Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute	1	—	3	1	0	0
Stanford University	16	6	6	3	4	2
Texas A&M University	9	4	10	4	6	2
University of California: Berkeley	8	3	9	4	5	2
University of California: Davis	0	—	3	1	5	2
University of California: Los Angeles	4	2	5	2	7	3
University of Florida	1	—	3	1	2	—
University of Michigan	1	—	3	1	1	—
University of New Mexico	1	—	4	2	0	0
University of Notre Dame	4	—	2	1	0	—
University of Texas at Austin	16	6	11	5	7	3
Yale University	6	2	4	2	1	—

and 6 percent of nonwinners, compared with 1 percent of Puerto Rican SAT-takers. About 1 percent of Mexican American and Puerto Rican SAT-takers planned to major in mathematics. The Mexican American proportions for mathematics were winners 4 percent, honorable mentions 2 percent, and nonwinners 1 percent. Three percent of Puerto Rican winners and 2 percent of honorable mentions planned a mathematics major; no nonwinners reported a mathematics major. Thus, it appears that Hispanic Semifinalists selected technical and quantitative fields at a relatively greater rate than the pool of college-bound SAT-takers.

Business and communications were also chosen by some Mexican American Hispanic Semifinalists (14 percent of winners and honorable mentions and 12 percent of nonwinners). Few Puerto Rican winners (3 percent) intended to major in business, but 8 percent of the honorable mentions and 16 percent of the nonwinners did. Overall, Puerto Rican semifinalists showed participation rates for these majors substantially below the 23 percent of the total Puerto Rican pool selecting business and communications.

Biology and health-related fields were also popular choices: 21 percent of Mexican American honorable mentions versus 16 percent of winners, and 34 percent of Puerto Rican honorable mentions versus 22 percent of winners.

Few Hispanic Semifinalists intended to major in education (only 1 percent to 3 percent) as is the case with Mexican American SAT-takers (5 percent) and Puerto Rican SAT-takers (4 percent). Similarly, the proportions in arts and humanities are small (among winners, 6 percent of Mexican Americans and 10 percent of Puerto Ricans; among honorable mentions, 9 percent of Mexican Americans and 6 percent of Puerto Ricans; and among nonwinners, 12 percent of Mexican Americans and 8 percent of Puerto Ricans). This compares with 10 percent of Hispanic and white SAT-takers who plan to major in arts and humanities. Social science encompasses many fields—psychology, economics, political science, history. When prelaw is included, the proportions of winners planning to major in these fields are 15 percent Mexican Americans and 11 percent Puerto Ricans, compared with 10 percent Mexican American honorable mentions and 9 percent Puerto Rican honorable mentions. The proportions are in line with all Hispanic SAT-takers (13 percent) when prelaw is included. Eight percent of white SAT-takers opt for the social sciences.

It appears that a substantial portion of this cohort of very bright Hispanic students plans to major in scientific and technical fields—engineering and computer science, medical fields, social science, and biological and physical sciences. This is good news, given the underrepresentation of Hispanics in engineering, science, and medicine, particularly at the Ph.D. levels.

Educational Aspirations

Hispanic Semifinalists have very high educational aspirations, and the program is now restricted to students who are seeking a four-year degree. Our data show that almost all in our survey expect to obtain at least a bachelor's degree (Table 47). More than three-quarters of the winners and honorable mentions plan to get a graduate degree compared with 47 percent of all Mexican American SAT-takers, 41 percent of Puerto Rican SAT-takers, and 44 percent of white SAT-takers. Puerto Rican honorable mentions show somewhat higher educational aspirations than do Puerto Rican winners. Sixty-four percent plan to pursue an M.D., a Ph.D., or other professional degree compared with 48 percent of Puerto Rican winners.

Summary

In choosing a college, respondents were most concerned about the academic quality and programs offered by the colleges. Although most of the institutions with four or more Hispanic Semifinalists enrolled are very prestigious, there are larger numbers of winners

Table 46. Intended Majors (in percentages)

	Winners		Honorable Mentions		Nonwinners		SAT-Takers*		
(N)	*MA (160)*	*PR (63)*	*MA (139)*	*PR (62)*	*MA (138)*	*PR (63)*	*MA*	*PR*	*White*
Biological science and health fields									
Health	3%	3%	6%	7%	7%	2%	16%	18%	15%
Premedical	9	13	11	19	7	10	†	†	†
Biological science and related	4	6	4	8	4	8	4	3	5
Business and communications	14	3	14	8	12	16	21	23	23
Physical science and related									
Physical science	3	3	2	2	4	6	1	1	2
Engineering	30	22	29	21	25	14	13	9	12
Mathematics	4	3	2	2	1	0	1	1	1
Computer science	10	16	7	13	8	18	11	14	9
Social science and related									
Social science	9	6	5	6	8	5	13	13	8
Prelaw	6	5	5	3	7	3	‡	‡	‡
Education	1	2	3	2	2	2	5	4	5
Arts and humanities	6	10	9	6	12	8	10	10	10
Other	1	2	1	0	1	2	2	2	1
Undecided	2	6	4	3	2	8	4	3	5

*Source: Arbeiter. *Profiles, College-Bound Seniors, 1984.*
†Premedical is included in Health. We were unable to disaggregate this for all SAT-takers.
‡Social science contains prelaw. We were unable to disaggregate this for all SAT-takers.
Note: Totals may not equal 100% because of rounding.

Table 47. Educational Aspirations by Degree Level (in percentages)

	Winners			Honorable Mentions			Nonwinners			SAT-Takers*		
(N)	*MA (160)*	*PR (65)*	*Other (6)*	*MA (143)*	*PR (63)*	*Other (9)*	*MA (138)*	*PR (65)*	*Other (24)*	*MA*	*PR*	*White*
Two-year training†	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	11%	1%	0%	0%	4%	5%	3%
Associate in Arts	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	2
B.A./B.S.	10	14	17	19	6	0	20	17	8	29	31	34
M.A./M.S.	34	29	0	33	22	33	33	23	29	27	23	26
M.D./Ph.D./other professional degree	45	48	67	41	64	56	36	43	50	20	18	17
Undecided	10	8	17	6	6	0	1	5	0	18	19	18
No response	0	2	0	2	2	0	1	5	0	0	0	0
Total graduate/professional study	79	77	67	74	86	89	69	66	79	47	41	44

*Source: Arbeiter. *Profiles, College-Bound Seniors, 1984.*
†This program is now restricted to students planning to go to a four-year college. In the first year of the program, two students selected two-year schools. The category "two-year training" may reflect these two students. We do not know if they were among the respondents.

than honorable mentions or nonwinners attending the most selective colleges.

A substantial proportion of semifinalists planned to major in scientific and technical fields. They are majoring in engineering at a greater rate than the pools of either Hispanic or white SAT-takers, although numbers are small; the proportion of Hispanic Semifinalists in mathematics and physical sciences is somewhat greater than that for the pools of Hispanic or white SAT-takers. Hispanic Semifinalists have very high educational aspirations compared with the pools of Hispanic or white SAT-takers.

First Year in College

Overall, most semifinalists reported that they performed well academically their first year in college, encountered few problems, and were active in college organizations. Because there was interest by the program administrators in determining any differences in first-year performance between males and females, we separated the semifinalists by gender to examine grades, problems encountered, participation in activities, and living arrangements.

Academic Performance

Nearly all applicants indicated grades of C or better; winners received better grades than did honorable mentions or nonwinners (Table 48). These grades were self-reported by respondents to the 12-page student questionnaire (Appendix C). About half the winners received mostly A's and B's versus 37 percent of honorable mentions and 30 percent of nonwinners. Twenty-one percent of winners received mostly A's versus 9 percent of honorable mentions and 6 percent of nonwinners. Very few students made below 2.5 (mostly B's and C's).

Table 48. Self-Reported First-Year Grades (in percentages)

(N)	*Winners (209)*	*Honorable Mentions (172)*	*Nonwinners (148)*
Mostly A's	21%	9%	6%
A's and B's	29	28	24
Mostly B's	23	31	28
B's and C's	19	21	24
Mostly C's	4	8	14
Mostly D's	1	1	3
Mostly F's	1	—	—
No grades	2	3	1

Males and females had similar GPAs their freshman year: male and female winners had GPAs of 3.2; male honorable mentions had GPAs of 3.0 versus 3.1 for females; male and female nonwinners had GPAs of 2.9 (Table 49).

Courses Taken. Many students appear to be in a liberal arts curriculum with emphasis on mathematics and science (Table 50). The largest proportion took mathematics, science (chemistry, physics, biology), English, computer science, history, psychology, foreign languages, and anthropology. We do not know how much the student's choice was influenced by distribution requirements. Few students took courses in fine arts, business, or education.

Hispanic Semifinalists appear generally to be very heavily enrolled in science, mathematics, and English and sparsely enrolled in fine arts. The largest proportion of winners took mathematics (85 percent), English (75 percent), and chemistry (53 percent). Honorable mentions favored the same courses: English (83 percent), mathematics (79 percent), and chemistry (51 percent). Among nonwinners the most popular courses were English (87 percent), mathematics (79 percent), philosophy (43 percent), and foreign language (42 percent).

Courses for Students of Non-English-Speaking Background

Few students took courses for individuals of non-English-speaking background their first year in college (Table 51). The majority of these students learned English (or both English and Spanish) as their first language and have a good command of English. Indeed, a higher proportion are fluent in English than in Spanish (see Language Background, p. 10).

Table 49. Self-Reported First-Year Grades by Sex (in percentages)

	Males			*Females*		
(N)	*Winners (103)*	*Honorable Mentions (83)*	*Nonwinners (91)*	*Winners (100)*	*Honorable Mentions (78)*	*Nonwinners (53)*
Mostly A's	20%	5%	7%	23%	13%	6%
A's and B's	29	27	26	28	26	23
Mostly B's	25	30	23	21	35	38
B's and C's	21	24	25	17	18	19
Mostly C's	1	11	14	8	5	11
C's and D's	1	—	3	0	1	4
No grades	2	4	1	2	3	0
Mean GPA	3.22	2.99	2.88	3.19	3.10	2.91

Table 50. Freshman-Year Courses (in percentages)

(N)	Winners (211)	Honorable Mentions (172)	Nonwinners (148)
Mathematics, science, engineering			
Mathematics	85%	79%	79%
Chemistry	53	51	40
Physics	34	27	22
Biology	20	29	28
Geology	5	6	7
Engineering	20	23	16
Computer science	29	32	24
Agriculture	1	1	2
Social science			
Psychology	32	37	33
Political science	24	28	28
Economics	28	21	22
Anthropology/sociology	21	20	26
History	38	38	41
Humanities			
English	75	83	87
Foreign language	40	38	42
Philosophy	20	22	43
Fine Arts			
Music	11	12	12
Art	17	15	15
Other			
Education	3	2	2
Business	5	8	7

Table 51. Courses for Students of Non-English-Speaking Background (in percentages)

(N)	Winners (197)	Honorable Mentions (150)	Nonwinners (144)
English for students of non-English-speaking background	1%	2%	3%
Reading and writing in first language*	10	8	5
Other subjects in first language*	7	2	2
Courses in history and culture of ancestors	12	14	8

* When first language is other than English.

Academic Difficulty

Although students performed well academically, many reported that the first year was more difficult than they expected (more than 40 percent of each group), and only about 17 percent to 19 percent of each group indicated it was easier (Table 52). Although we do not know why students found the first year more difficult than expected, we might speculate that this may have been caused in part by the high expectations of these students and their entry into much more competitive environments than their high schools. About 39 percent of winners, 30 percent of honorable mentions, and 37 percent of nonwinners indicated the first year was about what they expected.

Adjustment Problems

Overall, the students encountered few major problems in adjusting to social life their first year in college (Table 53). Almost one-third encountered some minor difficulty with roommates or being away from home, although about 60 percent or more of all three groups indicated these factors presented no problem. All Hispanic Semifinalists appear to have had little difficulty in making friends—76 percent of winners, 77 percent of honorable mentions, and 70 percent of nonwinners reported no difficulty in making friends. These students seem to fit into the mainstream at college as they did in high school.

Hispanic background does not appear to present a problem. Few encountered a problem because of speaking English with an accent (fewer than 10 percent of each group) or reported feeling out of place because of their background (20 percent of winners, 14 percent of honorable mentions, and 15 percent of nonwinners). Because the question is general, we do not know what aspects of the background may have caused difficulty. It may in part be a result of the distance from the student's native region and not to Hispanicism. Another factor may be the small proportion of Hispanics in the more elite colleges.

Slightly more problems related to academic life than to social life. The greatest stress was in managing time. More than three-quarters of the semifinalists reported a problem managing their time; 78 percent of winners, 83 percent of honorable mentions, and 79

Table 52. First-Year Academic Difficulty (in percentages)

(N)	Winners (210)	Honorable Mentions (172)	Nonwinners (148)
Much more difficult than expected	16%	17%	16%
Slightly more difficult than expected	28	36	28
About as expected	39	30	37
Slightly easier than expected	14	15	16
Much easier than expected	4	2	3

Table 53. Problems in Adjusting to College (in percentages)

	Winners			*Honorable Mentions*			*Nonwinners*		
(N)		*(208)*			*(170)*			*(147)*	
	Major	*Minor*	*None*	*Major*	*Minor*	*None*	*Major*	*Minor*	*None*
Being away from home	7%	34%	59%	8%	29%	62%	9%	33%	59%
Getting along with roommate(s)	10	27	63	6	29	65	4	30	65
Making friends	4	21	76	4	20	77	5	24	70
Getting to know teachers	17	44	39	11	44	45	17	39	45
Managing time	25	53	22	29	54	17	35	44	21
Getting work done on time	15	52	33	19	49	32	24	48	29
Taking part in class discussions	18	33	50	9	37	54	10	37	53
Speaking English with accent	2	6	92	1	7	92	1	8	91
Feeling out of place because of background	3	17	79	4	10	86	3	12	85
Gaining teachers' respect	3	17	79	2	11	87	3	19	78

percent of nonwinners said this was a problem. Most students also found it hard to get work done on time. Students performed very well academically and participated in activities, so whatever difficulties they faced were for the most part overcome.

The majority of the students recorded some problem in getting to know teachers. About 61 percent of winners, 55 percent of honorable mentions, and 56 percent of nonwinners reported a problem in getting to know teachers. Only 20 percent of winners, 13 percent of honorable mentions, and 22 percent of nonwinners had trouble in gaining teachers' respect.

Taking part in class discussions is a problem for about half the Hispanic Semifinalists; 51 percent of winners, 46 percent of honorable mentions, and 47 percent of nonwinners reported difficulty. This does not appear to be due to speaking with an accent, since few students report that to be a problem.

The overall pattern shows that these students had few problems their freshman year. We believe their good adjustment reflects their integration in high school, their proficiency in English, and their high achievements.

Freshman-Year Problems Encountered by Males versus Females

We wanted to determine if there were differences between males and females in their adjustment to college life. To explore this issue, we developed a scale to rank responses on problems: 2 equals a major problem; 1 equals a minor problem; 0 equals no problem. Thus, the score can range from 2 to 0. The scores for each item, comparing males and females by award categories, are shown in Table 54.

In most instances males and females in this cohort were similar in the problems they encountered, and differences are very small. Males had slightly more difficulty than females in managing time and getting work done on time. Female winners reported slightly less difficulty than males in making friends but slightly more in getting along with roommates.

Females appeared to have more difficulty than males in getting to know teachers, and female winners reported the highest score.

Participation in Extracurricular Activities

In addition to their strong academic performance, Hispanic Scholars and other Semifinalists were involved in a variety of extracurricular activities. Males showed higher rates of participation in sports, but overall participation by males and females was similar for most activities (Table 55).

Very few Hispanic Scholars (about 12 percent of males and 8 percent of females) were active in intercollegiate sports, and participation rates are similar for the other two categories. This is not surprising, given the emphasis on, and the time commitment to, academics. A majority of males took part in intramural or recreational sports. About one-third of the female winners, compared with more than 40 percent of the other female groups, participated in intramural sports, but over half (59 percent of winners and 58 percent of honorable mentions) participated in recreational sports.

Only a small proportion of Hispanic Semifinalists participated in musical groups (males: 19 percent of winners, 15 percent of honorable mentions, and 13 percent of nonwinners; females: 14 percent of winners, 12 percent of honorable mentions, and 8 percent of nonwinners). Participation in theater and other arts groups was also modest (males: 15 percent of winners, 12 percent of honorable mentions, and 6 percent of nonwinners; females: 18 percent of winners, 9 percent of honorable mentions, and 12 percent of nonwinners).

With the exception of recreational athletics, general or special interest clubs had the largest partici-

Table 54. Problems in Adjusting to College by Sex (Mean Scores)

	Males			*Females*		
	Winners	*Honorable Mentions*	*Nonwinners*	*Winners*	*Honorable Mentions*	*Nonwinners*
Being away from home	0.47	0.38	0.38	0.48	0.52	0.67
Getting along with roommate(s)	0.40	0.40	0.33	0.51	0.42	0.47
Making friends	0.32	0.26	0.32	0.23	0.27	0.38
Getting to know teachers	0.70	0.64	0.75	0.87	0.68	0.72
Managing time	1.10	1.24	1.14	0.95	0.99	1.29
Getting work done	0.88	0.92	0.90	0.77	0.77	0.98
Taking part in class discussions	0.63	0.53	0.48	0.71	0.60	0.74
Speaking English with accent	0.11	0.11	0.05	0.11	0.05	0.17
Feeling out of place because of background	0.25	0.19	0.30	0.21	0.19	0.11
Gaining teachers' respect	0.23	0.10	0.24	0.24	0.20	0.30

Note: Responses ranked on scale of 2 (major problem), 1 (minor problem), 0 (no problem).

Table 55. Activities in Freshman Year by Sex (in percentages)

	Males			*Females*		
	Winners	*Honorable Mentions*	*Nonwinners*	*Winners*	*Honorable Mentions*	*Nonwinners*
Intercollegiate sports	12%	11%	11%	8%	7%	10%
Intramural sports	54	65	56	32	41	46
Recreational athletics	65	73	70	59	58	48
Musical groups	19	15	13	14	12	8
Theater/other arts	15	12	6	18	9	12
General/special interest clubs	55	43	42	63	51	40
Hispanic clubs	40	32	30	39	31	19
Student government	6	12	14	3	12	4
Journalistic/literary	8	11	9	15	9	14
Community/church	29	26	19	35	34	34
Social clubs	19	35	23	19	19	24

pation rates. Among males 55 percent of the winners joined general or special interest clubs compared with 43 percent of honorable mentions and 42 percent of nonwinners. Among females the proportions are 63 percent versus 51 percent and 40 percent.

Males and females showed similar rates of participation in Hispanic clubs. Among winners 40 percent of males and 39 percent of females were members of Hispanic clubs. For honorable mentions the rates were 32 percent males and 31 percent females. For nonwinners the rates were 30 percent males and 19 percent females.

Involvement in student government among Hispanic Scholars was low (6 percent of males and 3 percent of females). The other categories were more likely to be active—14 percent of male nonwinners and 12 percent of female honorable mentions.

Relatively few students were in journalistic or literary activities. Fifteen percent of female winners and 8 percent of male winners participated in literary activities. Both student government and journalism require commitments of large amounts of time and are often dominated by upperclassmen. Given the freshman status and the strong emphasis on academics, these participation rates seem reasonable.

Students showed moderate levels of participation in community and church groups. This is consistent with the NHSAP emphasis on community activities. Among males, 29 percent of winners compared with 26 percent of honorable mentions and 19 percent of nonwinners participated. Among females the rates were 35 percent for winners and 34 percent for both honorable mentions and nonwinners.

Male and female winners were equally active in

Table 56. Freshman-Year Living Arrangements (in percentages)

	Males				*Females*			
	Total (N = 277)	*Winners*	*Honorable Mentions*	*Nonwinners*	*Total (N = 229)*	*Winners*	*Honorable Mentions*	*Nonwinners*
With family	16%	15%	10%	24%	12%	5%	20%	15%
On campus	78	83	82	68	80	87	70	83
Off campus but not with family	6	3	8	8	7	8	10	2

social clubs (19 percent). Thirty-five percent of male honorable mentions and 23 percent of male nonwinners were participants. Among females, winners and honorable mentions had the same levels (19 percent); the rate for nonwinners was 24 percent.

We believe these rates of participation in college activities are high for freshmen and demonstrate service and leadership qualities consistent with the selection criteria for the National Hispanic Scholar Awards Program. That these students fit into the mainstream of college life is also demonstrated.

Living Arrangements

Most students lived on campus freshman year, which may have contributed to their good academic performance and social integration into the institution. Among winners, the rates were 83 percent of males and 87 percent of females versus 82 percent of male and 70 percent of female honorable mentions and 68 percent of male and 83 percent of female nonwinners. It does not appear that there is a distinct pattern in living arrangements based on gender (Table 56).

Distance from Parents' Home. The majority of students (69 percent of winners, 63 percent of honorable mentions, and 53 percent of nonwinners) attended college 100 or more miles from home (thus, the high rate of campus residency). Only a small proportion lived within commuting distance. Winners were more likely than the other two groups to choose colleges 500 or more miles from home (40 percent); 28 percent of honorable mentions and 22 percent of nonwinners did so (Table 57).

Table 57. Distance of College from Parents' Home (in percentages)

Miles	*(N)*	*Winners (209)*	*Honorable Mentions (167)*	*Nonwinners (146)*
0–24		16%	23%	24%
25–99		14	14	24
100–499		29	35	31
500–999		8	7	6
1,000 or more		32	21	16

Table 58. Proportion Receiving Financial Aid (in percentages)

	(N)	*Winners (208)*	*Honorable Mentions (167)*	*Nonwinners (144)*
Federal aid				
Pell		41%	39%	33%
SEOG		25	18	14
NDSL		26	22	27
Work-Study		42	30	28
GSL		39	31	37
PLUS		3	3	3
ALAS		—	1	—
ROTC		2	3	1
Other federal		8	6	5
State aid				
Need-based		20	21	20
Non-need-based		12	15	8
On-campus employment		11	14	8
Loan		7	4	5
Other		2	2	5
Aid from other sources				
Grants and scholarships		100	100	47
Loans		15	10	11
Other		16	12	19

Financial Aid

A large proportion of Hispanic Semifinalists received financial aid, particularly need-based federal aid (Table 58). For example, 41 percent of winners, 39 percent of honorable mentions, and 33 percent of nonwinners received Pell Grants; 25 percent, 18 percent, and 14 percent, respectively, received Supplementary Educational Opportunity Grants (SEOG), and 39 percent, 31 percent, and 37 percent received Guaranteed Student Loans (GSL). Winners were more likely than were honorable mentions or nonwinners to be in work-study programs. Although the National Hispanic Scholar Awards Program is not need-based, the criteria include the ability to overcome barriers, which may be reflected in the financial need of the winners. Fewer nonwinners appear to be receiving aid, but 47 percent indicated they received grants or scholarships from sources other than federal or state programs.

Table 59. Money Owed at End of Freshman Year (in percentages)

	Winners	*Honorable Mentions*	*Nonwinners*
(N)	*(208)*	*(167)*	*(144)*
None	45%	52%	45%
Less than $1,000	11	12	9
$1,000–$2,999	30	25	33
$3,000 or more	13	11	13

Over half the winners (54 percent) and nonwinners (55 percent) owed some money after their first year in college compared with 48 percent of the honorable mentions (Table 59). Despite the NHSAP $1,500 award, a substantial proportion of the winners owned money after their freshman year. Forty-three percent of winners, compared with 36 percent of honorable mentions and 46 percent of nonwinners, incurred debts of $1,000 or more, although most owed less than $3,000.

Summary

Hispanic Semifinalists performed well their first year in college, both academically and socially, with winners showing the highest levels of achievement. A large proportion planned to major in engineering, mathematics, science, and other technical areas. Very few encountered major problems their first year; these high-achieving Hispanic students seemed to fit into the mainstream of college life as they fit into high school. Most students lived on campus and attended colleges 100 or more miles from their parents' homes. A large proportion of the students received financial aid. Most owed money at the end of the freshman year.

Student Perception of Program Benefits

The National Hispanic Scholar Awards Program is intended to be honorific, but one of the goals of the program is to encourage Hispanic students to attend four-year colleges and to enhance their chances of acceptance. Although we cannot determine what students would have done differently without the award, we were able to ask some questions about how they perceived the program, how they learned about the program, how the award affected their college choice, and how the $1,500 grant affected them financially.

Learning about the Program

When students are identified as eligible for the National Hispanic Scholar Awards Program, letters inviting them to apply are sent to them through their high school guidance counselors. Thus, the guidance counselor has a role to play in informing the student about the program through transmittal of the letter. Our data indicate that only about one-third of the students perceive the guidance counselor as the source of their awareness of the program (Table 60).

Most students learned about the program through the letter of invitation. About one-third learned of it from teachers or counselors. No one indicated he or she heard about the program from a friend. This is not surprising; since this was the first cohort in a new program, there would have been little chance to hear about it through the grapevine.

Students are now able to state, when they take the PSAT/NMSQT, whether they would like to participate in the NHSAP. It is also publicized through brochures and other means.

Student View of Award

All applicants are designated National Hispanic Semifinalists, and it is hoped that this recognition will encourage Hispanic students to apply to four-year colleges and will enhance their chances of acceptance and likelihood of attending. Since this is an elite academic group that would be expected to go to college, it is difficult to determine any value added by the designation Hispanic Semifinalist. We asked students, however, about their perception of the effect of the award. The greatest impact on all applicants appeared to be in increased self-confidence, with 87 percent of the winners so indicating. Over half the winners, but only about one-third of the other two groups, reported the designation helped them get into a good college, and smaller proportions believed that the designation helped them get into college. Slightly over 30 percent of the winners and 29 percent of the nonwinners said the award encouraged them to apply to more difficult colleges, but only 18 percent of the honorable mentions so indicated. About 40 percent of winners and honorable mentions believed the award helped them to get other scholarships. Thus, the small award and the designation as a semifinalist are perceived by students as having had a positive impact on their college choice. Overall, more winners reported effects from the designation than did the other two groups (Table 61).

Table 60. Source of Student Knowledge of NHSAP (in percentages)

	Winners	*Honorable Mentions*	*Nonwinners*
Letter of invitation	64%	58%	60%
Counselor/teacher	32	35	35
Friend	0	0	0
Other	4	7	5

Table 61. Student Perception of Effects of Designation as National Hispanic Semifinalist (in percentages)

(N)	*Winners* (206)	*Honorable Mentions* (166)	*Nonwinners* (144)
Increased self-confidence	87%	74%	67%
Helped entry into college	41	30	23
Helped entry into good college	55	33	33
Increased desire to go to college	34	20	17
Encouraged application to more difficult colleges	32	18	29
Increased chances of other scholarships	42	42	34

Table 62. Institutional Use of Winners' Awards

	Percentage Responding (N = 211)
Supplement other aid	34%
Replace other grants	26
Lessen loan burden	12
Some other way	22
Don't know	13

Table 63. Sophomore-Year Replacement of Award Funds

	Percentage Responding (N = 211)
Don't know	23%
Earnings	53
Family	42
College	31
Loan	23
Savings	22

Financial Impact

One possible negative side effect of the award might be that it would replace aid from the college in the freshman year, and students would then be unable to make up the $1,500 deficit in the sophomore year. This does not appear to be the case for most students. About 34 percent of the winners reported that the NHSAP funds were used to supplement other aid; about 12 percent indicated the $1,500 would lower their loan burden. We believe that use of the award by the institution to lower the amount of debt is a very effective way to use these funds, since many of the students will accumulate substantial debt while in college. About 26 percent said the funds were used to replace other aid, and 22 percent said "some other way" (Table 62).

Furthermore, only about 23 percent of the winners said they did not know how they would replace the funds in their sophomore year. The largest portion expected to use earnings and family funds to make up the deficit. About 31 percent indicated the college would replace this amount, and nearly one-fourth said loans and savings would be used (Table 63).

Virtually all students (100 percent of winners, 99 percent of honorable mentions and nonwinners) said they would recommend the program to others.

Summary

Students reported that the program had a positive effect in increasing their self-confidence and in helping them obtain other scholarships. Many winners believed that NHSAP funds supplemented other aid, lessened their loan burden, or both. Most students planned to make up the difference their sophomore year, primarily from earnings and their families.

Further Comparison of Winners and Nonwinners on Selected Variables

To explore the differences between winners and nonwinners more carefully, we performed significance tests for a number of variables that have the greatest interest for us and that reflect socioeconomic status, educational experience, and first-year performance in college. This section summarizes our findings.

Family Background Variables

Table 64 shows the results of significance tests for parents' occupation and education. There appears to be no significant difference between winners and nonwinners on this measure. Similarly, there is no significant difference between the two groups on mean number of years of parental education, although the difference in mother's education approaches significance, with winners showing lower levels of mother's education. As indicated in our discussion, most Hispanic Semifinalists are from professional families with high levels of education.

Table 64. Family Background Variables (Winners versus Nonwinners)

Variable	*Test*	*Significance*
Father's occupation	chi-square = 9.37	.50
Mother's occupation	chi-square = 14.2	.15
Father's education*	*t*-value = −1.21	.23†
Mother's education*	*t*-value = −1.71	.09†

*Mean number of years.
†Two-tailed test.

Language Use

We conducted significance tests on four variables concerned with language use: first language spoken as a child (English, Spanish, or both English and Spanish); predominant language spoken in the home; Spanish proficiency; and English proficiency. It appears that the proportions of winners and nonwinners who are native English speakers and who are from predominantly English-speaking homes are not significantly different. On the measures of Spanish and English proficiency, the two groups are similar as well (Table 65). As we discussed previously, most of the semifinalists have a good command of English and are from homes where English is spoken or both English and Spanish are spoken.

High School Experience

We performed *t*-tests on the following variables that reflect academic performance and/or high school experience: high school grade point average, SAT scores, number of activities, percentage of Hispanic students in high school, and hours per week in a part-time job. Four variables show significant differences between winners and nonwinners, with winners showing higher scores: high school GPA, SAT-verbal score, SAT-mathematical score, and number of high school activities. Two variables, Hispanic percentage in high school and hours per week in a part-time job, do not show a significant difference between winners and nonwinners. Thus, the variables that differentiate the Hispanic Scholars from the nonwinners reflect their superior academic performance, higher test scores, and greater participation in high school activities (Table 66).

Freshman-Year Performance

To determine if winners performed significantly differently from nonwinners, we also performed *t*-tests on three measures of freshman-year performance: grades, number of college activities, and problems (Table 67). Winners had significantly higher grades than nonwinners did, which indicates that from the criteria used, the selection committee is able to select the students who will perform best. Winners and nonwinners did not differ significantly on the number of college activities; most semifinalists participated in a wide range of activities. Nor did winners and nonwinners differ significantly in the problems encountered; most experienced few problems their freshman year.

Table 65. Language Use (Winners versus Nonwinners)

Variable	*Test*		*Significance*
Native language	chi-square		.67
Language in home	chi-square		.12
Spanish proficiency	*t*-value =	1.23	.22*
English proficiency	*t*-value =	−1.03	.31*

*Two-tailed test.

Table 66. High School Experience (Winners versus Nonwinners)

Variable	*t-value*	*Significance*†
HSGPA*	8.88	<.01
SAT-V	4.65	<.01
SAT-M	7.56	<.01
Number of activities	2.30	.02
% Hispanic in high school	−0.06	.95
Hours per week in part-time job	−1.51	.13

*High school grade point average.
†Two-tailed test.

Table 67. Freshman-Year Performance (Winners versus Nonwinners)

Variable	*t-value*	*Significance**
Grades freshman year	4.91	<.01
Number of college activities	1.65	.10
Problems freshman year	0.42	.67

*Two-tailed test.

Summary

Winners and nonwinners do not differ significantly on background variables that reflect parents' education, occupational status, or English language usage. The two groups do differ, however, on variables that reflect high school performance. Winners had significantly higher grades and SAT scores, and they participated in more activities in high school. These indicators reflect the qualities for which the winners are recognized. Furthermore, the winners performed significantly better than nonwinners during their freshman year, indicating that from the selection criteria, the program has been able to identify students who will perform best their first year in college.

Predicting First-Year Performance

We isolated factors that predict success in the college freshman year in terms of both academic performance and social adjustment to college life, because we believed this information would be useful to the NHSAP selection committee and to others interested in Hispanic education generally. In addition we examined award status as an independent variable to determine if this measure would predict success beyond the other indicators available.

Methodology

To carry out this analysis, we used a stepwise regression procedure (forward selection) to develop the best predictor equation employing as few variables as possible. This procedure includes variables only if they are statistically significant. The order of inclusion of variables is determined by the incremental contribution of each variable to explained variance; thus, the best predictor would be included first (Nie et al. 1970). In using this procedure, we also examined the residuals and, where they were very large, removed them from the equation and then compared the results to assure that one outlier did not distort our findings. In no instance did removal of the outlier alter our results. Although we recognize that the restriction of range on SAT scores, which resulted from selecting approximately 1,500 students from 27,000, may have had some effect on the correlation coefficients, we believe our results are a reasonable estimate for the 1,500 students but not for the entire population of 27,000.

We selected three outcome measures to examine freshman-year performance. As an indicator of academic performance, we used self-reported first-year grades; for social integration into the school, we used the number of activities in which students participated in their freshman year; and for adjustment to college life, we developed a scale using responses to a question on problems in adjustment.

For the most part we were interested in predicting freshman-year performance from a subset of variables that predicted our outcome variable and that reflected such factors as family background, high school experience, and educational aspirations. We were guided in our choice of variables by previous research and our interest in particular aspects of the high school experience, such as academic performance and existence of role models. We included intended major as a predictor variable; it met the time sequence requirement, since students indicated their intended major on the Student Descriptive Questionnaire when they were in high school. One exception is that our analysis for social integration includes distance from the family home and living on campus, both of which occur simultaneously with participating in activities. These two factors, however, are determined before the freshman year and can therefore be considered predictive. The following sections describe our analyses.

Academic Performance

To determine the best predictors of college academic performance as measured by freshman-year grades, we developed an equation using the following independent variables: gender, father's education, English proficiency, proportion of Hispanic students in high school, having a role model, number of advanced courses in high school, SAT scores, self-ratings of ability in mathematics and writing, educational aspirations, intended major, and award status (winner, honorable mention, nonwinner). Using a stepwise regression, we found the best single predictor of first-year grades was the high school GPA. The other two variables to enter the equation were a major in science and SAT scores. The GPA has a standardized regression coefficient (beta) of .2751 (Table 68). Thus, 1 standard deviation change in the independent variable is associated with a change of .28 in freshman-year grades. The partial correlation is .2668, indicating that about 7 percent of the variance in freshman-year grades can be predicted by high school grades. The second best predictor was a major in physical science and related areas. We combined as one major physical science, mathematics, computer science, and engineering. This is a negative predictor (beta equals −.1762), indicating that students who major in these areas had lower grades than those selecting other majors. The third, and last, variable to enter the equation was SAT scores (beta equals .1631).

The multiple *R* from the equation, using the three independent variables discussed, is .3771, indicating that there is a relatively strong association between first-year grades and these other factors. The R^2 is .1422, indicating that 14 percent of the variance in first-year grades can be explained by high school GPA, major, and SAT scores. This analysis suggests, however, that many differences in grades are explained by factors not captured in our equation. Certainly there are vast differences in grading among schools, in courses taken, and in students' motivation and abilities and other personal characteristics that affect performance and for which we did not have appropriate indicators.

The award status, or category, did not enter the equation as a significant predictor of first-year grades over and above the information already provided by grades, choice of major, and scores. To predict grades, we also ran a regression using high school GPA; major in science, mathematics, or engineering; SAT scores; and award status. Our results are given in Table 69. Again, the award status was a marginal predictor, suggesting that other factors included in the award status do not strongly predict first-year grades beyond what is captured in high school GPA, major, and SAT scores. This suggests that factors used beyond SAT scores and high school GPA in selecting students do not add to the prediction of first-year grades, and/or there are no award status effects on first-year grades. One should keep in mind, however, that academic performance is only one aspect of the program.

English proficiency did not show up as a significant predictor of first-year grades, but the effect of English proficiency may have been captured by SAT

Table 68. Prediction of First-Year Academic Performance

Dependent Variable = First-Year Grades

*Significant Predictors**	*Beta (standard regression coefficient)*	*Partial Correlation*	*t*	*t-Significance†*	*Multiple R‡*	*R^2*
High school GPA	.28	.27	4.1	<.01	.29	.08
Major in science	−.18	−.18	2.7	.01	.34	.12
SAT	.16	.17	2.5	.02	.38	.14

*Other variables considered that did not enter the equation as significant predictors are gender; father's education; English proficiency; proportion Hispanic in high school; having role model; number of advanced courses in high school; self-ratings of ability in mathematics and writing; educational aspirations; majors in biological science and medicine, arts and humanities, social science, business and communications; and award status.

†Two-tailed test.

‡At each step.

Table 69. Prediction of First-Year Academic Performance (Including Award Status as Predictor)

Dependent Variable = First-Year Grades

	Beta (standard regression coefficient)	*Partial Correlation*	*t*	*t-Significance**	*Multiple R†*	*R^2*
High school GPA	.25	.23	5.2	<.01	.29	.08
Major in science	−.17	−.17	−4.0	<.01	.34	.11
SAT	.13	.12	2.9	<.01	.37	.14
Award status	.09	.08	1.8	.07	.38	.14

*Two-tailed test.

†At each step.

scores. We wanted to determine if Spanish proficiency might predict first-year grades beyond the high school GPA, major in science, and SAT scores. We reran the equation, using those three significant variables and including a measure of Spanish proficiency. We found that Spanish proficiency is not a significant predictor of first-year grades (*p* equals .53).

We suspected that there would be a strong association among high school GPA, SAT scores, and award category, since both test scores and high school performance are used in the selection process. To explore this factor, we used the award status as a dependent variable and the high school GPA and SAT scores as independent variables. Our results (Table 70) show that the high school GPA is a fairly strong predictor of award status and that the SAT score is somewhat weaker but still moderately strong. Together the two predict award status fairly well: the multiple *R* equals .4820. This demonstrates the importance of these academic factors in the program because the NHSAP is selecting scholars—that is, individuals the selection committee believes will perform well academically. Our analysis further suggests, however, that there are other characteristics beyond academic ability that are included in the selection of the winners. First-year grades do not constitute the only outcome of interest, nor is academic ability the only selection criterion. Many qualitative factors such as leadership, community service, special talents, and barriers overcome may be an important part of the award process and are not captured by our equation.

We also explored other outcomes of the freshman year to better understand factors that predict adjustment to college life and social integration into the college. This is especially important for Hispanic students, and we wanted to determine if there are cultural or background factors that may be barriers to their adjustment.

Social Integration

To indicate social integration, we used the number of activities students participated in during the freshman year. We included the following independent variables in our equation: gender, English proficiency, father's education, proportion of Hispanic students in high school, distance from home, living on campus, number

Table 70. Prediction of Award Category from High School Grades and SAT Scores

	Dependent Variable = Award Category					
	Beta (standard regression coefficient)	*Partial Correlation*	*t*	*t-Significance**	*Multiple R†*	R^2
High school GPA	.35	.34	10.03	<.01	.41	.17
SAT	.26	.25	7.44	<.01	.48	.23

*Two-tailed test.
†At each step.

Table 71. Freshman-Year Social Integration

	Dependent Variable = Number of Freshman-Year Activities					
*Significant Predictors**	*Beta (standard regression coefficient)*	*Partial Correlation*	*t*	*t-Significance†*	*Multiple R‡*	R^2
Living on campus	.24	.21	4.9	<.01	.31	.10
Number of high school activities	.15	.15	3.4	<.01	.34	.12
Gender (female)	−.12	−.12	−2.7	.01	.36	.13
Distance from home	.12	.10	2.4	.02	.37	.14

*Other variables considered that did not enter the equations as significant predictors are English proficiency, father's education, proportion Hispanic in high school, major, high school GPA, and award status.
†Two-tailed test.
‡At each step.

of activities in high school, major, high school GPA, and award status. These variables were selected as the most promising, based on our interest and past research. We also placed more emphasis on manipulable variables such as distance from home, living on campus, and high school activities, because the ultimate goal is not only to predict social integration into college but to suggest ways to improve integration for other Hispanic students. The results are summarized in Table 71.

Among the variables examined, the best predictor of the number of activities students participated in during the freshman year was living on campus (beta equals .2415 and partial correlation equals .2130), a moderately strong association. This is consistent with the literature, which reports campus residence to be an important factor in integration into the college. It is not surprising that residential students are more involved with activities than are those who commute; most of the group we studied lived on campus their freshman year. The next-best predictor was the number of activities in high school (beta equals .1501 and partial correlation is .1478). Again, intuitively, it makes sense that students who were active participants in extracurricular activities in high school are most likely to be active in college. The third variable to enter the equation was gender; being female entered as a negative predictor (beta equals −.1186 and partial correlation equals −.1177), indicating that males participated slightly more than females. The final variable in the equation was distance from home (beta equals .1161 and partial correlation is .1026). This indicates that living farther from home increases the number of activities and captures some factors beyond the variable living on campus. These four variables have a moderately strong association with the number of activities (multiple R equals .3745; R^2 equals .1402). The award category did not enter into the equation as a significant predictor of the number of activities. Our analysis suggests that students who live on campus, participated in high school activities, are male, and live farthest from home are most likely to participate in college activities. However, the number of activities is a very crude measure of social integration; furthermore, we suspect that participation is a function of many personal, institutional, and other factors that are not easily quantified.

Problems in Adjustment

We were interested in determining the extent to which these students encountered problems in adjustment their first year in college. Of particular concern was the extent to which their culture and Hispanicism created a problem. As described earlier, we computed problems in adjustment by calculating a score for each item—based on major, minor, or no problem—ranging from 2 for a major problem to 0 for no problem and then summing the scores on the 10 items (see Tables 53 and 54 for a list of the 10 problems considered). We used the following variables to predict problems: gender, father's education, proportion of Hispanic students in high school, high school GPA, distance of college from home, born in United States, parents born in United States, English spoken in home, Spanish spoken in home, bilingual home, residing in Commonwealth, award status, preprofessional club in high school, student government in high school, and history club in high school (Table 72). The best single predictor was English proficiency, followed by father's education and distance from parents' home. Students who rated their English higher (lower score on the scale) had fewer problems (beta equals .1532; partial correlation equals .1513). Father's education was also a significant predictor (beta equals .1715; partial correlation equals −.1685). Higher levels of father's education are associated with fewer problems in adjustment. Thus, Hispanic students from better-educated families who speak English well have fewer problems in adjusting to college. Their backgrounds are probably more similar to those of the non-Hispanic students at the college. The third variable to enter the equation was distance from home (beta equals .1547; partial correlation equals .1505), indicating that students closer to their family home have fewer problems in adjustment. Although distance from home was an indicator of the number of activities (students farther from home participated more), this equation suggests that despite their better social integration, students at a greater distance have more adjustment problems. We suspect that part of the reason is that these students are likely to be in a region unfamiliar to them or have traveled to attend a larger and more impersonal institution, which may create additional problems in adjustment.

Award status does not have a significant association with problems in adjustment. Nonetheless, the students in our sample had very few problems in adjusting to college, and our descriptive analysis shows that generally winners had the fewest problems.

Association of Adjustment Problems and Extracurricular Activities with First-Year Performance

To gain a better understanding of the factors that affect first-year grades, we examined the association of adjustment problems and number of activities with the grades. Since these factors are occurring simultaneously, this analysis, unlike the previous analyses, does not predict performance. Nor are we able to attribute causality. But examination of the association of these factors adds to the general understanding of what may influence first-year grades. We used SAT scores as a measure of ability so that we could control for varying ability levels.

The correlations for the variables described are presented in Table 73. First-year grades have a significant association with SAT scores, indicating that students who score better on the SAT tend to have higher grades their freshman year. Unlike the other variables examined, SAT scores come before college freshman grades and are thus predictive of first-year performance. Participation in activities appears to be unrelated to grades or to SAT; thus, one cannot predict from SAT scores which students will be most active, and their activities neither enhance nor hinder academic performance. Problems in adjustment appear to

Table 72. Freshman-Year Problems

Dependent Variable = Problems in Adjustment

*Significant Predictors**	*Beta (standard regression coefficient)*	*Partial Correlation*	*t*	*t-Significance‡*	*Multiple R§*	*R^2*
English proficiency†	.15	.15	3.36	<.01	.17	.03
Father's education	−.17	−.17	−3.74	<.01	.22	.05
Distance from home	.15	.15	3.34	<.01	.27	.07

*Other variables considered that did not enter the equation as significant predictors are gender, high school GPA, born in U.S., English spoken in home, Spanish spoken in home, bilingual home, residing in Commonwealth, award status, parents born in U.S., preprofessional club in high school, student government in high school, and history club in high school.

†A lower score = higher proficiency.

‡Two-tailed test.

§At each step.

be negatively associated with first-year grades, but this variable has no significant association with SAT scores. Although students' perceptions of their freshman-year problems may be influenced by their grades, it appears that students who encounter more problems have lower grades. But before college one cannot predict by SAT scores which students are likely to encounter problems; those who have problems do not necessarily have the lowest ability.

The correlation matrix of grades, problems in adjustment, and participation in activities, when we are controlling for SAT scores, is shown in Table 74. The same pattern displayed in Table 73 is evident. Lower grades are associated with greater problems in adjustment but are not correlated with activities. This reinforces our finding that problems in adjustment are associated with lower grades, but we cannot predict from ability levels which students are likely to encounter problems.

Summary

This analysis explored three outcome measures of first-year performance and adjustment to college life: first-year grades, number of activities, and problems in adjustment to college life. We examined a number of variables that reflected such factors as family background, high school experience, and educational aspirations, as well as award status. Among the variables examined, the best predictor of first-year grades was the high school GPA, followed by a major in physical science, engineering, or mathematics (negative predictor), and SAT scores. Award status did not increase the prediction yielded by the equation, suggesting that the other factors that are incorporated in award status do not predict grades beyond the other three variables.

In examining the other two outcomes, we found that social integration into college life, as measured by the number of activities, is associated with participating actively in high school, being male, and living far from the family home. The results of our final equation—to examine problems in adjustment, particularly those derived from the effects of the cultural background—indicate that students who have a high level of English proficiency, who come from homes with higher levels of father's education, and who live closer to home have fewer problems in adjusting to college life. We also found that students with fewer problems in the freshman year tend to have higher grades, but students who encounter more problems are not necessarily those with lower levels of ability. Thus, one cannot predict in advance from SAT scores which students are likely to encounter problems.

Table 73. Intercorrelation of Freshman-Year Grades, Activities, and Problems

	Correlations			
	Grades	*Activities*	*Problems*	*SAT*
Grades	— —	−.03 p = .29	−.31 p = <.01	.22 p = <.01
Activities	−.03 p = .29	— —	.09 p = .03	−.03 p = .27
Problems	−.31 p = <.01	.09 p = .03	— —	−.02 p = .33
SAT	.22 p = <.01	−.03 p = .27	−.02 p = .33	— —

Table 74. Partial Correlations of Freshman-Year Grades, Activities, and Problems (Controlling for SAT Scores)

	Partial Correlations		
	Grades	*Activities*	*Problems*
Grades	— —	−.02 p = .33	−.32 p = <.01
Activities	−.02 p = .33	— —	.08 p = .03
Problems	−.32 p = <.01	<.01 p = .03	— —

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

General Discussion of Findings

Characteristics of High-Achieving Hispanic Students

Given problems of Hispanic students' access to, and performance in, the educational system, it is instructive to look at the characteristics and experiences of Hispanic students who have been highly successful. Our findings regarding characteristics of high-achieving Hispanic students, as reflected in this cohort of applicants, reveal the following:

- The students in our sample more closely resemble white than Hispanic college-bound students in terms of socioeconomic background as measured by parents' income and parents' education.
- They have an excellent command of English, and many are bilingual in English and Spanish, based on self-reported proficiency levels in these two languages.
- They received good academic preparation in high school, where they achieved at high levels and were well integrated into the social life.

- They have higher educational aspirations than do either white or other Hispanic college-bound students.
- A very large proportion intended to major in the physical sciences and related areas.
- They enrolled in highly selective colleges at least 100 miles from the family home and lived on campus.
- Although almost half found college more difficult than they had expected, they encountered few problems and performed well academically the first year of college.
- Although most came from financially well-off families, a large proportion took out loans to finance their college educations.

Socioeconomic Background. The students in our sample, when compared with the pool of Hispanic SAT-takers and white SAT-takers, more closely resembled the white pool in terms of parents' education and income. For example, the fathers' median number of years of education for our sample was 14.0 compared with 14.3 for whites and 12.0 for Hispanics; the mothers' median number of years of education was 13.4 for our sample compared with 13.6 for whites and 11.8 for Hispanics. The median income for the Hispanic Semifinalists is substantially above that of Hispanic SAT-takers and resembles the income level of white SAT-takers ($32,900). Mexican American SAT-takers had a median income of $19,900 compared with $32,653 for Mexican American winners, $35,000 for Mexican American honorable mentions, and $30,000 for Mexican American nonwinners. The median parental income for Puerto Rican SAT-takers was $15,600 compared with $30,555 for Puerto Rican winners, $38,461 for Puerto Rican honorable mentions, and $30,769 for Puerto Rican nonwinners.

As indicated in the literature review, socioeconomic background is an important predictor of academic achievement for Hispanics; those Hispanic students from higher socioeconomic levels achieve at higher levels and participate in higher education at a greater rate. As might be expected because the parents were well educated and the family income was relatively high, the fathers of the majority of the students in our study are professionals.

Language Background. Proficiency in English has also been shown to be an important predictor of academic success for Hispanic students (Durán 1983; Ford Foundation 1984; Nielsen and Fernández 1981). The ability to speak both English and Spanish is also related to success in school (Durán 1983; Nielsen 1986; Nielsen and Fernández 1981). A high proportion of students in our sample indicated that English was their first language and rated highly their command of English. They also reported using English frequently with their friends in high school, and a majority came from homes where only English or both English and Spanish are spoken. Most students reported that they understand, speak, read, and write Spanish with some fluency.

High School Preparation and Performance. The high school years are crucial to the academic success and participation of Hispanics in higher education. High school represents the greatest point of leakage from the educational pipeline for Hispanics (Astin 1982). Poor preparation in high school has been identified as a major cause of poor performance in and attrition from higher education (Astin and Burciaga 1981; Kent 1982; Noboa-Ríos 1982; Payán, Peterson, and Castille 1984).

The semifinalists had an excellent academic preparation during the high school years. Most of them attended schools that were predominantly non-Hispanic, and they were enrolled in an academic track—two factors that greatly increased their chances of success in high school. Attendance at a predominantly non-Hispanic (presumably white) school gave them access to the quality of education enjoyed by whites; enrollment in an academic track ensured that they would take the academically rigorous coursework necessary for success in college. Moreover, while in high school, a substantial portion of these students took advanced or honors courses; many took college-level courses in English, mathematics, science, and social studies.

High school grade point average and performance on standardized tests are also important predictors of success in college. These students performed well in high school; their GPAs and SAT scores (3.57, SAT-verbal 557, SAT-mathematical 602) were substantially above the mean for both the white (3.07, SAT-verbal 445, SAT-mathematical 487) and the Hispanic (2.92, SAT-verbal 371, SAT-mathematical 410) pool of SAT-takers. National Hispanic Semifinalists also participated in extracurricular activities and filled leadership positions in high school, a sign that they were well integrated into the mainstream of their high schools. Few students participated in ethnic (Hispanic-related) activities or in specific programs for Hispanics and other minorities, including bilingual and bicultural programs. It seems that in high school very little special attention was given to their Hispanic backgrounds, although the community and church activities in which they participated may have been ethnic-related.

Educational Aspirations. Although Hispanic students as a whole have fairly high degree aspirations in high school, a large proportion do not fulfill them (Nielsen and Fernández 1981). The National Hispanic Semifinalists have much higher degree aspirations than does the pool of white or Hispanic SAT-takers. Half of the semifinalists aspire to a graduate (Ph.D.) or professional degree compared with 17 percent of whites and 19 percent of Hispanics. Although we do not yet know how many of the semifinalists will attain graduate degrees, it seems that they have not experienced the barriers that prevent most Hispanics from fulfilling their educational goals and that they stand an excellent chance of attaining the degree levels to which they aspire.

Intended Majors. Hispanics (and all other minority groups except Asian Americans) are sorely underrepresented in the physical sciences and related areas. This group of high-achieving Hispanic students are once more atypical in that they intend to major in the physical sciences at a much greater rate than do white or Hispanic SAT-takers. That these students took substantially more mathematics and science in high school than did the pool of college-bound Hispanic students may account for this phenomenon. One reason given for the low representation of minorities in the sciences has been their attrition from these subjects in high school. This has not been the case with the semifinalists.

College Choice. Students in our sample based their choice of a college on its academic quality and the programs it offered. It is not surprising, therefore, that many of these students attended very prestigious schools. Most semifinalists attended a college at least 100 miles from their parents' homes, which is an indication that proximity to home—a factor considered by many Hispanics in choosing a college (So 1984)—was not a concern for these students. Most of the students in our sample, unlike most other Hispanic college students (who live at home), lived on campus. Campus residence has been identified as a factor that has positive effects on a number of college outcomes (Astin 1975; Astin and Burciaga 1981).

It seems that semifinalists chose a college they thought would offer them the best education; they were not concerned about its proximity or whether they would be able to live at home. This behavior suggests that financing attendance at such a college was not a problem for them as it is for many Hispanics. (One of the reasons given for Hispanics' tendency to attend nearby two-year colleges, and thus live at home, is lack of financing [So 1984]). As we will see below, however, the students in our sample are not exempt from financial strain as a consequence of their enrollment decisions.

First-Year Experiences in College. Almost half our sample reported that college was more difficult academically than they had expected. At the same time, however, they reported few major problems and performed well. They were also active in extracurricular activities, a sign of their integration into college life. In contrast to their lack of participation in Hispanic-related activities in high school, a large proportion belonged to Hispanic clubs in college. Perhaps, being in a strange setting, they feel the need to reaffirm their cultural identity. The problems reported most often by students were managing time and getting work done on time. Nearly all students in our sample received grades of C or better; very few students received below a 2.5.

Indebtedness. Although their families were financially well-off, most semifinalists reported having taken a loan to finance their college education. This may be because they chose to attend highly selective (probably expensive) colleges as well as to live on campus, which, although contributing to higher academic performance and increased integration, is also costly. The $1,500 award to winners may have helped to alleviate some of the financial burden for this group.

This profile of high-achieving Hispanic students suggests that Hispanic students who resemble their white counterparts socioeconomically, who are in the mainstream, who receive good academic preparation in high school, and who are well integrated into the educational setting are likely to succeed in college.

Predictors of First-Year Performance

In our analysis we also attempted to isolate factors that predicted success during the freshman year. Three outcome measures were selected for examination: academic performance as indicated by first-year grades; social integration into the college as measured by the number of activities participated in during the freshman year; and adjustment to college life as shown in responses to a question on problems of adjustment. We examined a subset of predictors that we believe will be useful to the NHSAP administrators in selecting candidates and to others in understanding ways of enhancing the opportunities for Hispanics to succeed in higher education. The following are the results of our analysis:

- The best predictors (among those we examined) of freshman grades are high school GPA and SAT scores.
- A major in physical science, mathematics, or engineering is predictive of lower grades.
- Living on campus, participating in activities in high school, being male, and living at a distance from the family home are the best predictors of the number of activities in which a student participates in college.
- The best predictors of few adjustment problems are English proficiency, father's education, and distance from the family home (a negative predictor).

Freshman Grades. The best predictors of freshman grades are high school GPA and SAT scores. We also found that a major in physical science, mathematics, or engineering is a negative predictor. A student majoring in these disciplines is more likely to have lower grades. This may indicate that these subjects are more difficult and more demanding.

Number of Activities. The number of activities in which a student participated in college was used as a measure of integration into the social life of the institution. Living on campus, the number of high school activities a student participated in, being male, and living at a distance from the family home are the best predictors of a student's college activities. Campus residence has been cited often as a factor that increases retention because it encourages students to take part in activities at their institutions. It seems reasonable that students who were active in high school activities would extend this behavior to college. This is the only area where gender seems to have any effect on freshman-year performance. Perhaps this can be explained by the traditional tendency of the Hispanic culture to ascribe a more passive role to women than to men. Another explanation may be that most professors are male and may befriend male students more easily. The last predictor, distance from the family home, is a logical one in that students who live far from their families must depend on the institution to provide their social as well as their academic life.

Problems in Adjustment. Problems in adjustment are increased by low proficiency in English and distance from the family home. They are decreased by high levels of father's education. The variables, English proficiency and father's education, suggest that those Hispanic students who are in the college mainstream—that is, who resemble their white counterparts in college—have fewer problems adjusting to college life. Students who live farther from their families have fewer supports, especially during their first year before they have had time to establish other support networks. Also, the farther they live from their families, the fewer opportunities they have to return home. Thus, they are likely to experience more problems in adjustment.

Suggestions for Policy

The majority of Hispanic students neither possess the characteristics, nor have had the experiences, of our sample that would predispose them to perform successfully in college. The high-achieving Hispanic students in our sample differ in almost every respect from most Hispanic students. Even the Hispanic SAT-takers with whom we have compared our sample are "a very select and small subsample of all Hispanics because of the operation of factors that inhibit receipt of a quality education among Hispanics" (Durán 1986, p. 228). Most Hispanic students are from low socioeconomic levels, have low levels of English proficiency, receive poor preparation in predominantly Hispanic high schools (where they enroll in a nonacademic track, receive poor counseling, do not participate in extracurricular activities, make low grades and low SAT scores), enroll in two-year colleges close to their homes, and live at home while they are in college.

The following suggestions are based on the experiences of the successful NHSAP students and on the problems of Hispanics who are not successful that are described in the literature review in the Introduction. We have formulated these suggestions to expand the opportunities for success in higher education to Hispanics beyond the elite group described in our study.

- Proficiency in speaking, reading, writing, and understanding English must be increased among Hispanic students.
- More Hispanics must be prepared for and encouraged to enroll in the academic track in high school.
- Hispanics must be better prepared in science and mathematics at an early age and encouraged to take science and mathematics courses in high school.
- Better counseling must be provided at the junior high and high school levels.
- Exposure to Hispanic role models in the form of Hispanic teachers and counselors must take place in high school.
- Hispanic students must be encouraged to enroll in four-year colleges and to live on campus.
- Financial aid must be made available, and college-bound students and their parents must be counseled regarding strategies for securing financial aid to ensure that the students attend a four-year college and live on campus.

It is fitting and proper that students such as the National Hispanic Semifinalists be honored and given recognition. It is also imperative that the opportunity to succeed in college be offered to all Hispanic students. These two goals are not mutually exclusive; they may even be complementary.

Program Benefits

The major focus of this study was the National Hispanic Scholar Awards Program. We wanted to determine the extent to which the program is meeting its major goal: to recognize the exceptional academic achievements of Hispanic high school seniors and encourage their participation in four-year colleges. We also wished to determine students' perceptions of the effect of the award.

It is evident from our analysis that the NHSAP is selecting very high-achieving Hispanic students and is able to identify students who will perform well academically their first year in college. Our descriptive analysis indicates that winners performed slightly better than nonwinners or honorable mentions their first year in college. Thus, it appears that the major goal of the program is being met.

In the selection process, students are evaluated on criteria in addition to demonstrated academic achievement. The other criteria, which cannot be measured by the data we have, include persistence; taking advantage of opportunities; personal strength; cultural awareness; jobs held and their impact on academic achievement; and moral outlook, values, character, and integrity. These factors may be reflected in such application materials as the student essay and the letters of recommendation. Our analysis suggests that the selection process successfully identifies students who possess these attributes.

From our data analysis we see evidence of leadership in the number of offices held and high school activities, which were higher among winners than among the other two categories. Special skills and extracurricular participation, also used in rating students, are evident especially among winners. Our analysis further shows that these students are more likely to become involved in college activities, so that by using the information available, the selection committee was able to select as scholars (winners) students who would have higher rates of participation in college activities (see Table 55). Scholars were also active in community and religious activities, an indicator of community service.

Most of the semifinalists are from families that are relatively well-off financially. Students selected as scholars appear to be only slightly less well-off and are slightly more likely to have foreign-born parents than are members of the eligible pool as a whole. For some students these factors may be indicators of the selection criterion "barriers overcome."

Another finding that may be of interest to the NHSAP administrators concerns the information on students who did not apply. In comparing the high school GPAs and standardized test scores of winners, honorable mentions, nonwinners, and nonapplicants (which we were able to obtain from the SAT files), we noticed that nonapplicants had test-score averages and high school GPAs above those of nonwinners. This suggests that there may be some very able students in that group who did not apply. (Of course, some of this group may not have been eligible to apply because they were not of Hispanic background but made a mistake in indicating ethnicity on the PSAT/NMSQT or SAT form.) We believe it would be useful to explore why certain students do not apply and to encourage those who are eligible to submit applications.

Data from our survey also suggest that students believe the award has some beneficial impact. All applicants reported increased self-confidence from being designated National Hispanic Semifinalists. Our data show additional beneficial effects for winners, who indicated the award encouraged them to go to more selective schools. They believed the designation helped them get into a good college, and many thought it encouraged them to apply to more difficult schools.

We believe the award also had some positive financial effects, even though the amount is small ($1,500). A high proportion of winners said the award helped them get other scholarships. Furthermore, it does not appear that replacing the $1,500 in the sophomore-year financial-aid package is a problem; most students believed they would be able to make up the difference.

Despite the relatively high family incomes of these students, most are receiving financial aid, and many are taking out loans. Over half the winners borrowed money their freshman year to go to college. Given this fact and the high cost of the colleges they select, we believe that one of the most effective ways that colleges can use the award in the financial-aid package is to lower the loan burden of students.

Other Program Recommendations

We examined only the first year of the program. Some of the recommendations suggested by our findings and presented to the College Board in the initial project report have already been implemented, most notably efforts to enlarge the applicant pool* and to increase communication with guidance counselors.

Although there have been efforts to expand the involvement of guidance counselors, we believe that they should become even more active in the program and in encouraging students to apply. Given the importance of letters of recommendation in the selection of students, increased interaction between students and counselors should be fostered.

We recommend that data on program applicants and information from their applications be computerized for easy access and better record keeping. We also recommend that data on the students be retained in computer files for future studies. These data contain a wealth of information that could be useful to the program administrators, to the selections committee, and to others interested in Hispanic education.

---

* Efforts to increase the pool of applicants include mailings of brochures about the program to Hispanic organizations, meetings with Hispanic educators, inclusion of information about the program in the PSAT/NMSQT bulletin, and meetings with guidance counselors. In addition the program will, in some cases, consider students who did not take the PSAT/NMSQT but are nominated by their guidance counselors. In the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, students are now identified through the Prueba de Aptitud Académica (PAA) as well as the PSAT/NMSQT, with equal numbers of winners selected from public and private schools each year. The PAA is a Spanish-language college admissions test for students applying to Latin American colleges.

It is clear that the major goal of the program is being met in the identification of high-achieving Hispanic students. However, given the need to encourage greater numbers of Hispanic students to pursue higher education in four-year colleges, we recommend that more emphasis be placed on outreach to students who more closely resemble most Hispanic students.

Further Research

In this study we were able to examine only a limited number of issues. Our analysis represents only one step in understanding the factors that contribute to high educational attainment by Hispanic students. Several areas that are directly related to this study and would draw upon information from the same students merit investigation:

- *Follow-up of all Hispanic Semifinalists.* In this study we have collected a great deal of information about a group of high-achieving Hispanic students—their high school preparation and their freshman-year performance. It would be useful to know, however, how these students progressed through college and their rate of entry into graduate and professional school, how they fared in the labor market and the careers they chose. We recommend a follow-up survey for 1988, when these students will have graduated, assuming they completed college in four years.
- *Further investigation of student characteristics.* Most of the National Hispanic Semifinalists come from backgrounds that differ from those of most Hispanic students: relatively high family income, college-educated father, academic program in high school, strong English proficiency, low proportion of Hispanics in high school, and participation in a large number of advanced courses in high school, particularly in mathematics and science. There were some students, however, who deviated from this profile. We believe it would be useful to examine this group of "different" semifinalists carefully, since they resemble the majority of Hispanic students and have been able to overcome many of the barriers Hispanic students encounter.
- *Effective schools for Hispanics.* Fifteen high schools contributed five or more Hispanic Scholars. Several of these schools are small, rural high schools; others are urban schools with special entrance requirements; and some have no distinctive characteristics evident on the surface. We believe it would be useful to examine in some detail the programs and institutional environments of these schools to learn more about the factors that contribute to success for Hispanic students.
- *Assessment of the roster's effectiveness.* The NHSAP lists all semifinalists on a roster that is sent to all four-year colleges and universities for use in recruitment. Since this practice was not initiated during the first year of the program, our assessment did not include an examination of the effect of the roster. We believe it would be useful to survey admissions officers at institutions to which the roster was sent to determine how helpful it has been to them in their recruitment efforts.

APPENDIX A: COMPARISON OF MAINLAND AND COMMONWEALTH PUERTO RICANS

It has long been the contention of researchers who are familiar with the diversity among and within Hispanic subgroups that presenting aggregate data on Puerto Rican students in United States colleges and universities without accounting for differences between mainland and Commonwealth groups tends to mask the more disadvantaged position of Puerto Ricans raised on the mainland (Durán 1983; Kent 1982; Noboa-Ríos 1982).

A comparison by Kent (1982) of the socioeconomic and educational characteristics of mainland Puerto Rican SAT-takers with those of Commonwealth SAT-takers reveals that Commonwealth SAT-takers tend to come from higher socioeconomic backgrounds, as measured by parental income and education, and to have better high school records as well as higher degree aspirations than do mainland SAT-takers. Other important differences between the two groups involve language background and employment during high school: a much higher percentage of mainland Puerto Ricans consider English to be their best language. Kent concluded that these findings "reflect the different class origins of the two groups of . . . undergraduates in U.S. colleges: Puerto Ricans attending mainland high schools are likely to be children of Puerto Ricans who migrated to the continental United States in earlier decades and thus to be of working-class background, whereas those from Island high schools tend to be children of upper-class parents" (p. 68).

This section compares characteristics of the mainland and the Commonwealth Puerto Ricans in our sample in order to present a more accurate picture of these two groups. We also believe this will help clarify data about mainland Puerto Ricans in our study for comparison with other mainland Puerto Rican samples. We caution the reader, however, to be careful in generalizing results because cell size is often very small; but we believe that these two groups provide an interesting data base to study regardless of the potential for generalizing beyond the National Hispanic Scholar Awards Program Semifinalists. In addition, it should be noted that most of the Commonwealth applicants attended private secondary schools. They were identified through scores on the PSAT, which in the Commonwealth is primarily given to private school students. The identification process was changed in the program's second year, so that subsequent applicants were from both public and private schools.

The cohort of Puerto Rican semifinalists contains 144 students from the mainland and 54 from the Commonwealth who completed the SDQ information. Of these, 95 (66 percent) mainland Puerto Ricans and 40 (74 percent) Commonwealth Puerto Ricans responded to the 12-page student questionnaire.

Although the two groups are more similar than different in the variables we examined, some distinguishing factors are family background characteristics and English and Spanish use. Commonwealth Puerto Ricans are from somewhat higher socioeconomic backgrounds in terms of the father's occupation, parental education, and family income. We believe this difference is partly attributable to the fact that most of the Commonwealth students in our sample attended private secondary schools and do not represent the overall Commonwealth high school population. Spanish is more likely to be the first language for Commonwealth Puerto Ricans. Mainlanders are more likely to have English as their dominant language and to come from bilingual homes. The two groups are similar in the methods they used to select a college and in the majors they chose. Commonwealth students, however, had somewhat higher degree aspirations than did their mainland counterparts. Despite the differences we have noted above, the two groups performed much the same in their first year in college—although mainlanders were more likely to find the first year more difficult than they had expected. Another difference is that a higher proportion of Commonwealth students received financial aid. The following sections provide detailed data on the similarities and differences revealed in our research.

Demographic Background

Parents' Occupation

A larger proportion of Commonwealth Puerto Ricans compared with the mainland sample are from families in which the father is a professional or manager or owner (80 percent versus 63 percent). Among Commonwealth students winners are more likely to be from such families than are honorable mentions or nonwinners, but for mainlanders, winners are the least likely to be from such families (Table A.1).

There appears to be less difference between mainland and Commonwealth Puerto Ricans in terms of the mother's occupation. About one-third of each group are homemakers, and 28 percent of mainland mothers are professionals or managers or owners compared with 35 percent of Commonwealth mothers. Mainland winners are the most likely to have mothers employed as professionals, while Commonwealth winners are the least likely (Table A.2).

Parents' Education

There appear to be substantial differences between the parental education level of mainland and Commonwealth Puerto Ricans in our sample; Commonwealth Puerto Ricans come from families with higher

Table A.1. Father's Occupation (in percentages)

	Mainland				*Commonwealth*			
	*W**	*HM†*	*NW‡*	*All*	*W*	*HM*	*NW*	*All*
(N)	*(38)*	*(32)*	*(16)*	*(86)*	*(15)*	*(8)*	*(17)*	*(40)*
Professional/manager/owner	58%	66%	69%	63%	93%	63%	77%	80%
Skilled/clerical/sales	21	13	13	16	0	38	6	10
Service/unskilled	16	13	6	13	0	0	6	3
Farmer	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Unemployed	3	3	0	2	0	0	0	0
Retired	3	6	13	6	7	0	12	8

*Winners.
†Honorable Mentions.
‡Nonwinners.
Note: Totals may not equal 100% because of rounding.

Table A.2. Mother's Occupation (in percentages)

	Mainland				*Commonwealth*			
	W	*HM*	*NW*	*All*	*W*	*HM*	*NW*	*All*
(N)	*(40)*	*(34)*	*(18)*	*(92)*	*(15)*	*(8)*	*(17)*	*(40)*
Professional/manager/owner	40%	15%	29%	28%	27%	38%	41%	35%
Skilled/clerical/sales	13	32	33	24	20	50	18	25
Service/unskilled	13	3	6	8	0	0	0	0
Homemaker	25	38	33	32	47	13	29	33
Unemployed	10	12	0	9	0	0	12	5
Retired	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	3

levels of education. Ninety-two percent of the Commonwealth fathers have some college, 84 percent a bachelor's degree, and 58 percent a graduate or professional degree. Sixty-two percent of the mainland fathers have some college, 47 percent a bachelor's degree, and 28 percent a graduate or professional degree. Among Commonwealth Puerto Ricans, the nonwinners have the highest levels of fathers' education, but differences between the three groups of mainland Puerto Ricans are trivial (Table A.3).

Commonwealth Puerto Ricans also show higher levels of mothers' education than do mainland Puerto Ricans (Table A.4). About half the mainland Puerto Rican mothers have some college and 32 percent have a bachelor's degree; 92 percent of the Commonwealth mothers have some college and 64 percent hold at least a baccalaureate. Twenty-three percent of Commonwealth mothers hold advanced degrees versus 11 percent of mainland mothers.

Parental Income

Most mainland and Commonwealth Puerto Rican semifinalists are from families with income above $25,000 (66 percent of mainland and 67 percent of Commonwealth). A larger proportion of Commonwealth students compared with mainlanders are from families with incomes above $50,000 (44 percent of Commonwealth, 27 percent of mainland) (Table A.5).

We also asked students to indicate how many persons are dependent on the family income, counting themselves and their parents where applicable. About 5 percent of the mainland Puerto Ricans indicated two persons, which suggests a single-parent home, while no Commonwealth student appears to be from a home with only two persons dependent on the family income. Overall, mainland Puerto Ricans are from somewhat smaller families: about 39 percent of Commonwealth Puerto Ricans have six or more people dependent on family income versus 19 percent of mainland Puerto Ricans (Table A.6).

Summary

Although most semifinalists are from middle-class families, as measured by parental occupation, education, and income, Commonwealth Puerto Ricans show higher levels of income and education than do mainland Puerto Ricans, but they also have more persons dependent on that income.

This is consistent with other research comparing mainland and Commonwealth Puerto Rican SAT-takers (Kent 1982). Note, however, that although Kent's study shows that Commonwealth Puerto Ricans have

Table A.3. Father's Education Level (in percentages)

	Mainland				Commonwealth			
	W	*HM*	*NW*	*All*	*W*	*HM*	*NW*	*All*
(N)	*(41)*	*(33)*	*(18)*	*(92)*	*(15)*	*(8)*	*(17)*	*(40)*
Grade school	15%	15%	0%	12%	13%	0%	0%	5%
Some high school	7	6	11	8	0	0	0	0
High school diploma	15	18	11	15	0	25	0	5
Business/trade school	2	3	6	3	0	0	0	0
Some college	12	6	17	11	0	13	6	5
Associate degree	5	0	11	4	0	0	6	3
Bachelor's degree	15	15	11	14	33	13	18	23
Some graduate/professional school	2	6	11	5	0	0	6	3
Graduate/professional degree	27	30	22	28	53	50	65	58

Table A.4. Mother's Education Level (in percentages)

	Mainland				Commonwealth			
	W	*HM*	*NW*	*All*	*W*	*HM*	*NW*	*All*
(N)	*(38)*	*(35)*	*(18)*	*(91)*	*(15)*	*(8)*	*(17)*	*(40)*
Grade school	16%	0%	6%	8%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Some high school	8	11	6	9	7	0	0	3
High school diploma	16	34	17	23	0	13	6	5
Business/trade school	11	9	11	10	0	0	6	3
Some college	11	17	17	14	20	25	12	18
Associate degree	3	3	11	4	20	0	6	10
Bachelor's degree	11	17	11	13	40	25	29	33
Some graduate/professional school	11	3	11	8	7	0	12	8
Graduate/professional degree	16	6	11	11	7	38	29	23

Table A.5. Parental Income (in percentages)

	Mainland				Commonwealth			
	W	*HM*	*NW*	*All*	*W*	*HM*	*NW*	*All*
(N)	*(41)*	*(33)*	*(17)*	*(19)*	*(15)*	*(8)*	*(16)*	*(39)*
Less than $10,000	12%	6%	18%	11%	13%	0%	6%	8%
$10,000–$24,999	24	27	18	24	27	25	25	26
$25,000–$49,999	39	36	41	39	13	13	38	23
$50,000–$74,999	17	21	6	17	33	50	6	26
$75,000 or more	7	9	18	10	13	13	25	18

Table A.6. Number of Persons Dependent on Parental Income (in percentages)

	Mainland				Commonwealth			
	W	*HM*	*NW*	*All*	*W*	*HM*	*NW*	*All*
(N)	*(42)*	*(35)*	*(18)*	*(95)*	*(15)*	*(8)*	*(17)*	*(40)*
Two	5%	6%	6%	5%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Three	19	20	11	18	20	0	6	10
Four	33	31	50	36	13	13	41	25
Five	26	11	22	20	27	13	35	28
Six	7	14	11	11	27	38	12	23
Seven	7	14	0	8	0	13	6	5
Eight	2	0	0	0	13	13	0	8
Nine or more	0	3	0	0	0	13	0	3

much higher family incomes as well as more highly educated parents than their mainland counterparts, both groups constituting the National Hispanic Semifinalist Puerto Rican subsample, while echoing this difference, have much higher incomes and higher levels of parents' education than the Kent sample of SAT-takers. For example, in the Kent study over one-third of the fathers of Commonwealth students versus only one-tenth of the fathers of mainland students had studied beyond the baccalaureate. In terms of parental income, 5.6 percent of Commonwealth students said their parents' annual income was $50,000 or more compared with 2.8 percent of mainland students. By comparison, 61 percent of Commonwealth semifinalists versus 33 percent of mainland semifinalists had fathers who had studied beyond a bachelor's degree. A greater proportion of Commonwealth semifinalists (44 percent) and mainland semifinalists (27 percent) were from families with incomes above $50,000.

Language Background

Predominant Language

Mainland and Commonwealth Puerto Ricans show very different patterns of language use (Tables A.7 and A.8). Nearly all Commonwealth Puerto Ricans are native Spanish speakers: 83 percent spoke Spanish as their first language and 13 percent learned both Spanish and English as native languages. Similarly, Spanish or both Spanish and English were spoken in most of the homes: 83 percent indicated Spanish was used most often in the home and 15 percent reported both English and Spanish. Most Commonwealth Puerto Ricans spoke Spanish or Spanish and English among their friends: 78 percent spoke Spanish among their friends and 20 percent spoke Spanish and English (Table A.9).

Mainland Puerto Ricans are much more likely to have English as the predominant language. Forty-six percent spoke English as their first language, and 23 percent learned both English and Spanish. Only about a third came from all-English-speaking homes: 46 percent indicated that both English and Spanish were used in the home and 34 percent said English was the language used in the home. Nearly all mainland Puerto Ricans (82 percent) spoke English among their friends. This is consistent with the large proportion who were in schools with a non-Hispanic majority. About 15 percent spoke both English and Spanish among their friends and only 2 percent spoke Spanish.

Self-Assessment of English and Spanish Proficiency

Consistent with the English and Spanish usage patterns among mainland and Commonwealth Puerto Ricans are their self-assessments of proficiency in the two languages. Nearly all mainland Puerto Ricans rated their ability to understand, speak, read, and write English extremely well: 98 percent for understanding English, 88 percent for speaking, 96 percent for reading, and 86 percent for writing. Commonwealth Puerto Ricans rated themselves somewhat lower, although all know English: 68 percent understand English extremely well; 45 percent speak English extremely well; 80 percent read English extremely well; and 43 percent write English extremely well (Table A.10).

Commonwealth Puerto Ricans rated themselves higher in Spanish proficiency than did mainland Puerto

Table A.7. First Language Spoken as a Child (in percentages)

	Mainland				*Commonwealth*			
	W	*HM*	*NW*	*All*	*W*	*HM*	*NW*	*All*
(N)	*(42)*	*(33)*	*(17)*	*(92)*	*(15)*	*(8)*	*(17)*	*(40)*
English	50%	46%	35%	46%	0%	0%	12%	5%
Spanish	29	30	41	32	93	100	65	83
Both English and Spanish	21	24	24	23	7	0	24	13

Table A.8. Language Spoken in Home (in percentages)

	Mainland				*Commonwealth*			
	W	*HM*	*NW*	*All*	*W*	*HM*	*NW*	*All*
(N)	*(42)*	*(35)*	*(18)*	*(95)*	*(15)*	*(8)*	*(17)*	*(40)*
English	26%	43%	33%	34%	0%	0%	6%	3%
Spanish	14	29	11	19	93	88	71	83
Both English and Spanish	57	29	56	46	7	13	24	15
Other	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0

Table A.9. Language Used among Friends (in percentages)

	Mainland				Commonwealth			
(N)	*W (42)*	*HM (35)*	*NW (17)*	*All (94)*	*W (15)*	*HM (8)*	*NW (17)*	*All (40)*
English	83%	89%	65%	82%	0%	0%	6%	3%
Spanish	0	3	6	2	87	88	65	78
Both English and Spanish	14	9	29	15	13	13	29	20
Other	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table A.10. Self-Assessment of English Proficiency (in percentages)

	Mainland (N = 95)			*Commonwealth (N = 40)*			
	Ext. Well	*Well*	*Mod. Well*	*Ext. Well*	*Well*	*Mod. Well*	*Not Well*
Understand spoken English	98%	1%	1%	68%	33%	0%	0%
Speak English	88	9	3	45	40	15	0
Read English	96	3	1	80	20	0	0
Write English	86	10	4	43	38	18	3

Table A.11. Self-Assessment of Spanish Proficiency (in percentages)

	Mainland (N = 95)					*Commonwealth (N = 40)*				
	Ext. Well	*Well*	*Mod. Well*	*Not Very Well*	*Not at All*	*Ext. Well*	*Well*	*Mod. Well*	*Not Very Well*	*Not at All*
Understand spoken Spanish	36%	26%	22%	13%	3%	98%	3%	0%	0%	0%
Speak Spanish	17	24	26	25	7	95	3	3	0	0
Read Spanish	19	30	33	13	6	98	3	0	0	0
Write Spanish	13	22	33	23	10	90	8	3	0	0

Ricans. Most mainland Puerto Ricans know Spanish but rated their ability to understand, speak, read, and write Spanish as well, moderately well, or not very well. Nearly all Commonwealth Puerto Ricans gave themselves a rating of extremely well (Table A.11).

Summary

As might be expected, mainland and Commonwealth Puerto Ricans differ in their use of English and Spanish. English is the predominant language for mainland Puerto Ricans, while Commonwealth Puerto Ricans are more likely to have Spanish as their first language. Mainland Puerto Ricans are more likely than Commonwealth Puerto Ricans to be from bilingual homes. This is consistent with data from Kent (1982) and Noboa-Ríos (1982) on differences in English and Spanish proficiency and usage between Commonwealth and mainland Puerto Rican students.

High School Preparation

Type of High School

Nearly all Commonwealth Puerto Ricans (92 percent) attended private schools, while about one-third of mainland Puerto Ricans attended nonpublic schools (Table A.12). The very large proportion of Commonwealth students in private schools may be explained by the fact that the first cohort (1983–84) of Commonwealth semifinalists was selected from among students who had taken the PSAT/NMSQT in English (this test is administered only in English in private schools in Puerto Rico). The proportion of both mainland and Commonwealth Puerto Ricans in private schools is higher than the 23 percent of mainland Puerto Rican SAT-takers who attended private schools (see Table 22). Over 90 percent of both groups were in a college preparatory track (97 percent of mainland and 92 per-

Table A.12. Type of High School and Program (in percentages)

	Mainland				Commonwealth			
	W	*HM*	*NW*	*All*	*W*	*HM*	*NW*	*All*
High school type								
Public	65%	73%	59%	66%	8%	0%	12%	8%
Nonpublic	35	28	42	34	92	100	89	92
(N)	(52)	(51)	(41)	(144)	(13)	(12)	(26)	(51)
High school program								
Academic/college preparatory	100%	96%	95%	97%	92%	100%	88%	92%
General	0	2	5	2	8	0	12	8
Career-oriented	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0
(N)	(51)	(51)	(41)	(143)	(13)	(12)	(25)	(50)

Table A.13. High School Class Size (in percentages)

	Mainland				Commonwealth			
(N)	*W* (51)	*HM* (50)	*NW* (41)	*All* (142)	*W* (31)	*HM* (12)	*NW* (26)	*All* (51)
Fewer than 100	8%	4%	15%	9%	77%	75%	73%	75%
100–249	29	8	24	20	23	17	19	20
250–499	26	42	32	33	0	0	8	4
500–749	18	26	12	19	0	0	0	0
750 or more	20	20	17	19	0	8	0	2

cent of Commonwealth students). Although slightly more Commonwealth Puerto Ricans were in a general rather than an academic or a college preparatory track, our analysis of subjects taken (later shown in Table A.15) indicates there are few differences in coursework between the two groups. Thus, the difference in type of program may be a function of a single track in a small private high school rather than any substantive difference.

Size of High School Class

As stated above, most Commonwealth Puerto Ricans went to private schools, which have small classes: 75 percent attended schools with fewer than 100 in their graduating class. Mainlanders show diversity in the type of school attended. Somewhat less than one-third attended schools with fewer than 250 in their graduating class; another third were in schools with between 250 and 500 and slightly over one-third in schools with more than 500 in their graduating class. Nineteen percent of mainland Puerto Ricans were enrolled in large (more than 750 students per class) high schools; only 2 percent of Commonwealth Puerto Ricans attended such schools (Table A.13).

Proportion of Hispanics in High School

As expected, nearly all Commonwealth Puerto Ricans (95 percent) attended high schools with a majority of Hispanic students. Most mainland Puerto Ricans attended high schools with a majority of non-Hispanics. Over half (58 percent) the mainlanders were in high schools with fewer than 10 percent Hispanic and 82 percent in high schools with fewer than 30 percent Hispanic. Only 10 percent attended schools with over 50 percent Hispanic; nonwinners (22 percent) were much more likely than winners (7 percent) or honorable mentions (9 percent) to attend high schools with a Hispanic majority (Table A.14).

Academic Subjects Taken

A majority of both Commonwealth and mainland Puerto Ricans took four or more years of English and mathematics and three or more of social studies (Table A.15). Nearly all members of both groups took at least one year of biology, and most took two or more years of physical science. Commonwealth students studied somewhat more social studies and foreign language than mainland students, but the groups had about the same number of years of English.

Table A.14. Proportion of Hispanic Students in High School (in percentages)

		Mainland				*Commonwealth*			
		W	*HM*	*NW*	*All*	*W*	*HM*	*NW*	*All*
	(N)	*(42)*	*(35)*	*(18)*	*(95)*	*(15)*	*(8)*	*(17)*	*(40)*
Less than 10%		57%	63%	50%	58%	0%	0%	6%	3%
10–19%		14	11	6	12	0	0	0	0
20–29%		12	9	17	12	0	0	0	0
30–39%		7	6	6	6	7	0	0	3
40–49%		2	3	0	2	0	0	0	0
50% or more		7	9	22	10	93	100	94	95

Advanced/Honors Courses

A large proportion of both Commonwealth and mainland Puerto Ricans took advanced courses in high school (Table A.16). For both groups mathematics showed the greatest participation rate. Commonwealth students were more likely than mainland students to take advanced courses in a foreign language (50 percent versus 29 percent), but mainlanders were more likely to take advanced courses in social studies (30 percent versus 9 percent). In other subject areas the two groups showed similar participation rates. This indicates that although small, the schools the Commonwealth Puerto Ricans attended are able to provide a strong college preparatory curriculum, offering advanced courses in all areas.

Academic Performance in High School

High school grades and SAT and Achievement Test scores for mainland and Commonwealth Puerto Ricans are given in Table A.17. Because the numbers are small and the standard deviations sometimes large, one should be cautious in comparing award categories. Table A.17 does clarify Table 33 by presenting separately data on mainland Puerto Rican semifinalists, so that this group can be compared with all mainland Puerto Rican SAT-takers (whose scores are given in Table 33).

Mainland and Commonwealth Puerto Ricans have very similar grade point averages (3.5 versus 3.7, respectively). Commonwealth students show somewhat higher SAT-mathematical scores (616 versus 589). Level I Mathematics Achievement (601 versus 582) and Spanish Achievement (762 versus 650) also show higher Commonwealth scores. Mainland Puerto Ricans show somewhat higher scores on English Achievement (547 versus 506). SAT-verbal scores are similar (547 for mainland versus 538 for Commonwealth).

High School Activities

Both Commonwealth and mainland Puerto Rican semifinalists took part in a wide range of activities in high school (Table A.18). Mainland students had higher rates of participation than Commonwealth students in athletics (68 percent versus 59 percent), religious activities (49 percent versus 33 percent), preprofessional clubs (19 percent versus 7 percent), and ethnic organizations (16 percent versus 7 percent). Commonwealth Puerto Ricans were more involved in student government (50 percent versus 35 percent). In art, music, and dance and in social clubs the two groups were similar. The extent of participation in high school activities shows the degree to which the mainland Puerto Ricans were integrated into the social life of their high schools.

Among mainlanders, winners were more active than honorable mentions or nonwinners in religious activities, journalism, and student government. The cell sizes for the three categories of Commonwealth Puerto Ricans are too small for us to make meaningful comparisons.

Part-Time Work in High School

Mainland Puerto Ricans were more likely to hold a part-time job in high school than were Commonwealth Puerto Ricans (54 percent versus 31 percent), and mainland Puerto Ricans worked more hours (Table A.19). Among the mainland students, winners worked more hours than did honorable mentions or nonwinners. The cell sizes for the three groups of Commonwealth students are too small for meaningful comparisons.

Summary

Although most Commonwealth Puerto Ricans attended small, private secondary schools, there were not large differences between Commonwealth and mainland Puerto Ricans in subjects taken or advanced courses completed. A majority of both groups took four or more years of mathematics and English, three years of social studies and foreign language, and two or more years of physical science. Mainland Puerto Ricans came from high schools of all sizes, but most attended high schools with fewer than 10 percent Hispanics.

Both mainland and Commonwealth students

Table A.15. Number of Years of Academic Study by Subject (in percentages)

	Mainland				Commonwealth			
	W	HM	NW	All	W	HM	NW	All
(N)	(52)	(51)	(41)	(144)	(13)	(12)	(26)	(51)
English								
1 yr	0%	2%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%
2 yr	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3 yr	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	2
4 yr	98	96	95	97	85	92	92	90
4+ yr	0	2	5	2	15	8	4	8
None	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mathematics								
1 yr	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0
2 yr	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0
3 yr	3	12	7	8	0	17	15	12
4 yr	64	63	68	65	54	50	77	65
4+ yr	31	26	20	26	46	33	8	24
None	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Foreign language								
1 yr	2	2	5	3	8	0	0	2
2 yr	19	31	20	24	0	0	8	4
3 yr	35	26	39	33	0	8	8	6
4 yr	25	35	24	29	62	50	65	61
4+ yr	17	4	10	10	31	33	19	26
None	2	2	2	2	0	8	0	2
Biological science								
1 yr	65	59	71	64	69	75	81	77
2 yr	29	28	24	27	31	25	15	22
3 yr	6	8	2	6	0	0	0	0
4 yr	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0
4+ yr	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	2
None	0	4	2	3	0	0	0	0
Physical science								
1 yr	10	12	15	12	23	17	15	18
2 yr	39	47	46	44	23	33	46	37
3 yr	39	33	37	36	39	50	25	39
4 yr	10	6	2	6	15	0	4	6
4+ yr	4	2	0	3	0	0	0	0
None	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Social studies								
1 yr	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0
2 yr	10	10	15	11	0	0	4	2
3 yr	39	41	37	39	8	33	31	26
4 yr	42	45	42	43	50	50	54	52
4+ yr	10	4	5	6	42	17	12	20
None	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

showed high levels of participation in extracurricular activities. This attests to the degree to which the mainland group were integrated into their high schools. Mainlanders were somewhat more likely than Commonwealth Puerto Ricans to hold a part-time job and to work more hours. This is consistent with data from the Kent (1982) study, which show that 56 percent of mainland seniors worked part-time while attending high school compared with one-third of Commonwealth seniors. Mainland seniors also tended to work more hours per week than did Commonwealth seniors.

College Selection

Factors Affecting College Choice

For both mainland and Commonwealth Puerto Ricans the most important factors in selecting a college were academic reputation (81 percent and 80 percent) and

Table A.16. Proportion Taking Advanced Courses (in percentages)

	Mainland				Commonwealth			
(N)	W (52)	HM (51)	NW (41)	All (144)	W (15)	HM (12)	NW (27)	All (54)
English	56%	37%	44%	46%	47%	58%	41%	46%
Mathematics	58	41	34	65	47	83	44	54
Foreign language	29	29	27	29	60	58	41	50
Biological science	23	12	17	17	7	8	19	13
Physical science	23	22	22	22	13	42	11	19
Social studies	35	26	29	30	7	8	11	9
Art/music	2	2	2	2	0	0	0	0

Table A.17. Mean High School GPA, SAT Scores, and Achievement Test Scores

	Mainland									Commonwealth								
	Winners			Honorable Mentions			Nonwinners			Winners			Honorable Mentions			Nonwinners		
	Score	N	SD	Score	N	SD	Score	N	SD	Score	N	SD	Score	N	SD	Score	N	SD
HSGPA	3.7	51	.32	3.5	51	.39	3.3	41	.40	3.9	12	.27	3.9	11	.28	3.6	23	.36
SAT-V	571	52	67	552	51	74	513	41	73	553	15	60	522	12	77	537	27	63
SAT-M	618	52	72	599	51	72	542	41	70	643	15	64	626	12	49	596	27	81
Spanish	664	21	108	610	13	113	674	10	131	777	13	13	768	6	11	748	16	80
Math. I	596	26	66	574	22	69	563	11	59	614	9	32	595	8	26	596	69	17
English	564	36	86	544	30	64	520	20	66	529	14	74	483	11	79	502	20	72

	All Mainland Puerto Ricans			All Commonwealth Puerto Ricans		
	Score	N	SD	Score	N	SD
HSGPA	3.5	143	.41	3.7	46	.33
SAT-V	547	144	75	538	54	65
SAT-M	589	144	77	616	54	72
Spanish	650	44	115	762	35	55
Math. I	582	59	66	601	34	53
English	547	86	76	506	45	75

Table A.18. Participation in High School Activities (in percentages)

	Mainland				Commonwealth			
(N)	W (52)	HM (51)	NW (41)	All (144)	W (15)	HM (12)	NW (27)	All (54)
Ethnic/racial organizations	21%	16%	10%	16%	0%	8%	11%	7%
Journalism	50	41	37	43	73	58	48	57
Art/music/dance	44	47	42	44	60	25	44	44
Preprofessional clubs	21	24	12	19	7	8	7	7
Religious activities	52	49	34	49	40	42	26	33
Social clubs/community organizations	48	63	49	54	60	67	52	57
Student government	44	31	29	35	73	58	33	50
Athletics	69	61	76	68	40	75	63	59

available majors (75 percent and 73 percent). (See Table A.20.) Academic reputation was most important among the mainland winners. Available financial aid was more important for mainland Puerto Ricans than for Commonwealth Puerto Ricans (57 percent versus 43 percent), which is consistent with the somewhat higher parental incomes among Commonwealth semifinalists. Although very few (5 percent) Commonwealth students considered distance from home important in college selection, about 23 percent of

Table A.19. Part-Time Work (in percentages)

		Mainland				Commonwealth			
Hours per Week	*(N)*	*W (51)*	*HM (51)*	*NW (41)*	*All (143)*	*W (13)*	*HM (12)*	*NW (24)*	*All (49)*
None		45%	45%	49%	46%	61%	83%	67%	69%
Fewer than 6		6	10	2	6	39	18	21	25
6–10		14	12	5	11	0	0	8	4
11–15		12	8	17	12	0	0	0	0
16–20		10	14	18	13	0	0	4	2
More than 20		14	11	9	12	0	0	0	0

Note: Totals may not equal 100% because of rounding.

Table A.20. "Very Important" Factors Affecting College Choice (in percentages)

		Mainland				Commonwealth			
	(N)	*W (41)*	*HM (34)*	*NW (18)*	*All (93)*	*W (15)*	*HM (8)*	*NW (17)*	*All (40)*
Academic reputation		90%	80%	61%	81%	87%	88%	71%	80%
Available majors		73	83	61	75	53	88	82	73
Financial aid		59	63	38	57	40	50	41	43
Cost		29	40	29	33	29	50	41	39
Setting		44	49	39	45	47	63	47	50
Size		29	17	17	21	13	38	18	20
Distance from home		22	23	24	23	7	13	0	5
Social atmosphere		24	32	17	26	13	63	29	30
Know people there		0	9	0	3	13	13	6	10
Friends going there		0	9	0	3	0	0	0	0
Other Hispanic students		5	6	0	4	0	0	0	0
Sports		10	6	0	7	0	25	12	10

mainland students thought this important. Social atmosphere was an important factor to about 26 percent of mainland and 30 percent of Commonwealth respondents, and size was important to about 20 percent of both groups. Other factors—knowing people there, having friends who are going there, the presence of other Hispanic students, and the availability of sports—were not important to either group.

Colleges Attended

All but three Commonwealth Puerto Rican semifinalists attended college on the mainland (Table A.21). Commonwealth Puerto Ricans were more likely to attend private colleges and universities than were mainland Puerto Ricans (82 percent versus 65 percent), and overall they appear to be attending more prestigious institutions, which may be a factor in the slightly higher proportion receiving financial aid (later shown in Table A.29).

The institutions with two or more semifinalists are listed in Table A.22. The most popular choice for both groups was Harvard University or Radcliffe College, followed by the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cornell University, and the City University of New York for mainland Puerto Ricans and Brown University and the University of Pennsylvania for Commonwealth Puerto Ricans.

Table A.21. Type of College Attended

	Mainland		Commonwealth	
	N	*%*	*N*	*%*
U.S. Mainland				
2-year college	2	2	0	0
4-year public college	30	33	3	9
4-year private college	59	65	28	82
Commonwealth	0	0	3	9
Total	91	100	34	100

Intended Majors

Science and technical fields were chosen by a large proportion of both mainland and Commonwealth Puerto Ricans. The majors most frequently selected by the mainlanders were engineering (19 percent), computer science (16 percent), and premedical (14 percent). Among the Commonwealth Puerto Ricans,

Table A.22. Institutions Attended by Puerto Rican Semifinalists

	Mainland		*Commonwealth*	
	N	*%**	*N*	*%**
Harvard/Radcliffe	6	7	6	18
Massachusetts Institute of Technology	5	5	1	3
Cornell University	5	5	1	3
City University of New York	4	4	0	0
Columbia University	3	3	0	0
Duke University	3	3	0	0
Princeton University	3	3	2	6
University of Florida	3	3	0	0
University of Pennsylvania	2	2	3	9
Boston College	2	2	1	3
University of California: Berkeley	2	2	0	0
University of Texas at Austin	2	2	0	0
Tulane University	2	2	0	0
University of Michigan	2	2	1	3
Brown University	1	1	6	18
Georgia Institute of Technology	1	1	2	6
University of Notre Dame	1	1	2	6
University of Puerto Rico	0	0	2	6
State University of New York at Stony Brook	2	2	0	0
New York University	2	2	0	0
Other	40	40	7	20
Total	91	92	34	101

*Totals do not equal 100% because of rounding.

the most usual choices were engineering (18 percent), premedical (14 percent), business and communications (14 percent), and computer science (12 percent). Few in either group planned to major in education or arts and humanities. Mainland Puerto Ricans were much more likely than Commonwealth Puerto Ricans to indicate a major (97 percent versus 84 percent) (Table A.23).

Educational Aspirations

Commonwealth Puerto Rican semifinalists in our sample have somewhat higher educational aspirations than do mainland Puerto Ricans (Table A.24). All Commonwealth students plan to get at least a master's degree and 67 percent a doctorate or other professional degree. About 17 percent of mainland students plan to get a baccalaureate, 26 percent a master's degree, and 47 percent a doctorate. About 10 percent of both groups are undecided.

Summary

Academic reputation and available majors were the most important considerations for both groups in selecting a college. Nearly all Commonwealth Puerto Ricans attended college on the mainland and were somewhat more likely than mainland Puerto Ricans to attend very selective private institutions. Engineering and premedical were the most usual choices of majors for both groups. Commonwealth Puerto Ricans were

Table A.23. Intended Majors (in percentages)

	Mainland				*Commonwealth*			
(N)	*W (50)*	*HM (50)*	*NW (40)*	*All (140)*	*W (13)*	*HM (12)*	*NW (25)*	*All (50)*
Biological science and health fields								
Health	4%	8%	3%	5%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Premedical	14	18	8	14	8	25	12	14
Biological science and related	6	10	8	8	8	0	8	6
Business and communications	2	6	18	7	8	17	16	14
Physical science and related								
Engineering	24	18	15	19	15	33	12	18
Physical science	2	0	8	3	8	8	4	6
Mathematics	2	2	0	1	8	0	0	2
Computer science	20	14	15	16	0	8	20	12
Social science and related								
Social science	4	2	5	4	22	8	0	8
Prelaw	6	4	5	5	0	0	0	0
Psychology	0	4	3	2	0	0	0	0
Education	2	2	3	2	0	0	0	0
Arts and humanities	10	8	11	9	0	0	4	2
Other	2	0	0	1	0	0	4	2
Undecided	2	4	3	3	23	0	20	16

Note: Totals may not equal 100% because of rounding.

Table A.24. Educational Aspirations by Degree Level (in percentages)

	Mainland				*Commonwealth*			
	W	*HM*	*NW*	*All*	*W*	*HM*	*NW*	*All*
(N)	*(52)*	*(51)*	*(41)*	*(144)*	*(12)*	*(11)*	*(23)*	*(46)*
B.A./B.S.	17%	8%	27%	17%	0%	0%	0%	0%
M.A./M.S.	29	28	22	26	33	0	30	24
M.D./Ph.D./other professional degree	44	59	37	47	67	91	57	67
Undecided	10	6	15	10	0	9	13	9

Table A.25. Self-Reported First-Year College Grades (in percentages)

	Mainland				*Commonwealth*			
	W	*HM*	*NW*	*All*	*W*	*HM*	*NW*	*All*
(N)	*(41)*	*(35)*	*(18)*	*(94)*	*(15)*	*(8)*	*(17)*	*(40)*
Mostly A's	24%	6%	6%	14%	27%	0%	18%	18%
A's and B's	17	14	17	16	40	63	29	40
Mostly B's	27	40	33	33	13	13	24	18
B's and C's	27	17	17	21	13	13	6	10
Mostly C's	5	11	17	10	0	13	24	13
C's and D's	0	3	11	3	0	0	0	0
No grades	0	9	0	3	7	0	0	1
GPA*	3.2	2.9	2.7	3.0	3.4	3.1	3.1	3.2

*We estimated GPA using the following scale: A's = 4.0; A's and B's = 3.5; B's = 3.0; B's and C's = 2.5; C's = 2.0; C's and D's = 1.5.

more likely than mainland Puerto Ricans to select business or social science. Commonwealth semifinalists have somewhat higher educational aspirations than their mainland counterparts do (just as the Commonwealth seniors did in the Kent [1982] study). Two-thirds of the former (67 percent) compared with over two-fifths of the latter (47 percent) planned to get an advanced degree.

First Year in College

Academic Performance

Both groups of Puerto Rican semifinalists showed strong academic performance their first year in college, and winners in both groups had the highest grades. The difference between Commonwealth and mainland appears trivial (3.2 versus 3.0) (Table A.25).

Academic Difficulty

A larger proportion of mainland Puerto Ricans than students from the Commonwealth indicated the first year was more difficult academically than expected (56 percent versus 35 percent). Half of the Commonwealth students reported the first year was about what they expected, and 15 percent said it was easier. Among mainlanders the proportions are 31 percent and 14 percent (Table A.26).

Living Arrangements

Nearly all (95 percent) Commonwealth Puerto Ricans lived on campus. Because most (91 percent) attended college on the mainland, this is not surprising. Among mainland Puerto Ricans 77 percent lived on campus, 20 percent at home with their family, and 3 percent off campus but not with their family (Table A.27). This is consistent with the distance of the campus from the family home: about 24 percent of the mainland Puerto Ricans attended college less than 25 miles from home. Most mainlanders (63 percent) enrolled in colleges more than 100 miles from home and 27 percent were more than 500 miles from home (Table A.28).

Financial Aid

A higher proportion of Commonwealth Puerto Ricans received federal financial aid for college compared with mainland Puerto Ricans. Because the sample for the Commonwealth students is small (38), one should be cautious in making inferences from these data about federal aid to Puerto Rican students generally. (See Table A.29.) The higher proportions of Commonwealth semifinalists receiving aid may reflect the

Table A.26. First-Year Academic Difficulty (in percentages)

	Mainland				*Commonwealth*			
	W	*HM*	*NW*	*All*	*W*	*HM*	*NW*	*All*
(N)	*(42)*	*(35)*	*(18)*	*(95)*	*(15)*	*(8)*	*(17)*	*(40)*
Much more difficult than expected	17%	23%	22%	20%	13%	0%	12%	10%
Slightly more difficult than expected	36	34	39	36	13	38	29	25
About as expected	33	29	28	31	60	50	41	50
Slightly easier than expected	14	9	11	12	7	13	12	10
Much easier than expected	0	6	0	2	7	0	6	5

Table A.27. Freshman-Year Living Arrangements (in percentages)

	Mainland				*Commonwealth*			
	W	*HM*	*NW*	*All*	*W*	*HM*	*NW*	*All*
(N)	*(41)*	*(35)*	*(18)*	*(94)*	*(15)*	*(8)*	*(17)*	*(40)*
With family	17%	23%	22%	20%	0%	0%	12%	5%
On campus	78	74	78	77	100	100	88	95
Off campus but not with family	5	3	0	3	0	0	0	0

Table A.28. Distance of College from Parents' Home (in percentages)

	Mainland				*Commonwealth*			
	W	*HM*	*NW*	*All*	*W*	*HM*	*NW*	*All*
Miles (N)	*(40)*	*(35)*	*(17)*	*(92)*	*(15)*	*(8)*	*(16)*	*(39)*
0–4	8%	3%	0%	4%	0%	0%	13%	5%
5–24	18	26	12	20	0	0	0	0
25–99	23	6	12	14	0	0	6	3
100–499	35	31	47	36	0	0	0	0
500–999	3	6	24	8	7	0	0	3
1,000 or more	15	29	6	19	93	100	81	90

higher tuition at the mainland colleges they attend, additional travel costs, and larger numbers of persons dependent on the parental income.

Indebtedness

Despite their high family incomes, a majority of both mainland and Commonwealth Puerto Ricans owed money at the end of their freshman year: 61 percent of mainland and 70 percent of Commonwealth (Table A.30). Most owed $2,000 to $3,000; a few (9 percent of mainland and 11 percent of Commonwealth) owed more than $5,000. The high proportion of indebtedness among the students is consistent with the high-cost institutions selected by many.

Problems Encountered

Few students had major problems their freshman year. Commonwealth Puerto Ricans appear to have encountered fewer problems than mainlanders did, particularly in managing time, getting work done, and getting to know teachers. A greater proportion of the Commonwealth group indicated a problem in taking part in class discussions (20 percent versus 11 percent), but only 10 percent of Commonwealth and 1 percent of mainland students reported a major problem due to speaking English with an accent. About 4 percent of mainland Puerto Ricans said they felt out of place because of their background, but no Commonwealth Puerto Rican found this a major problem. Commonwealth semifinalists were more likely to have a major problem with roommates (10 percent versus 4 percent of the mainlanders), although approximately the same proportion of both groups (10 percent mainland and 8 percent Commonwealth) reported being away from home a problem (Table A.31).

Summary

Both groups performed well their first year in college and encountered few problems in adjustment. Mainland Puerto Ricans were somewhat more likely to

Table A.29. Proportion Receiving Financial Aid (in percentages)

	Mainland				Commonwealth			
(N)	W (33)	HM (26)	NW (16)	All (75)	W (15)	HM (8)	NW (15)	All (38)
Federal aid								
Pell	41%	45%	53%	37%	50%	50%	27%	41%
SEOG	37	27	12	28	54	13	13	28
NDSL	31	25	29	28	46	50	20	36
Work-Study	56	26	29	39	60	75	40	55
GSL	49	44	47	46	50	63	53	54
PLUS	0	0	6	1	0	0	0	0
ALAS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
ROTC	0	4	6	3	0	0	0	0
Other federal	6	4	18	7	13	0	13	11
State aid								
Need-based	25	15	20	21	0	0	13	6
Non-need-based	13	15	13	14	0	0	0	0
On-campus employment	27	8	13	18	0	14	7	6
Loan	7	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
Other	6	8	6	6	0	0	0	0
Aid from other sources								
Grants and scholarships	100	100	50	91	100	100	27	71
Loans	29	0	13	16	10	29	20	19
Other	21	27	31	22	27	0	7	13

Table A.30. Money Owed at End of Freshman Year (in percentages)

	Mainland				Commonwealth			
(N)	W (39)	HM (33)	NW (18)	All (90)	W (15)	HM (8)	NW (14)	All (37)
None	39%	39%	39%	39%	27%	25%	36%	30%
Less than $500	3	3	0	2	7	0	7	5
$500–$999	3	9	6	6	0	0	0	0
$1,000–$1,999	8	9	17	10	13	0	0	5
$2,000–$2,999	23	21	22	22	33	25	43	35
$3,000–$3,999	10	6	6	8	13	25	7	14
$4,000–$4,999	8	3	0	4	0	0	0	0
$5,000 or more	8	9	11	9	7	25	7	11

Table A.31. Major Problems Encountered (in percentages)

	Mainland				Commonwealth			
(N)	W (41)	HM (35)	NW (18)	All (94)	W (15)	HM (8)	NW (17)	All (40)
Being away from home	10%	9%	11%	10%	13%	0%	6%	8%
Getting along with roommate(s)	7	3	0	4	27	0	0	10
Making friends	5	3	0	3	7	0	6	5
Getting to know teachers	19	6	17	14	13	13	0	8
Managing time	37	37	33	36	13	13	18	15
Getting work done	27	17	29	24	0	25	29	16
Taking part in class discussions	18	3	11	11	13	38	18	20
Speaking English with accent	0	3	0	1	20	13	0	10
Feeling out of place because of background	5	6	0	4	0	0	0	0
Gaining teachers' respect	5	0	13	4	0	0	0	0

indicate the freshman year was more difficult academically than expected, but grades of the two groups were similar. Commonwealth Puerto Ricans were more likely to live on campus because most were attending colleges on the mainland, but a majority of mainland Puerto Ricans also lived on campus. Despite their high family incomes, many students received financial aid, borrowed money to attend college, or both. This is a function of the high-cost, selective institutions many of these students are attending.

Conclusion

Although the two groups in our study show differences consistent with those of the mainland and the Commonwealth Puerto Ricans in the Kent (1982) sample, the differences between the samples used in the two studies are also interesting. The National Hispanic Scholar Awards Program Semifinalist sample is from a relatively higher socioeconomic level (as measured by parents' education and income) than the Kent sample, and therefore the between-group differences are less pronounced. The same is true of the differences in educational aspirations: the NHSAP sample reported much higher degree aspirations than the Kent sample. Our interpretation of these between-sample differences is that both groups constituting our semifinalist Puerto Rican sample are less representative of mainland and Commonwealth SAT-takers than the Kent sample is, although they exhibit similar between-group differences. This also supports our contention that the NHSAP Semifinalist sample is, overall, an elite group that differs both socioeconomically and academically from the total Hispanic college-bound population.

APPENDIX B: SELECTION PROCESS

The National Hispanic Scholar Awards Program (NHSAP) selects outstanding Hispanic students and awards winners with $1,500 college scholarships and honorable mentions with $100 cash awards. In addition to the cash awards, all National Hispanic Semifinalists are listed on a roster that is sent to all four-year colleges and universities for use in recruitment. The selection process is similar to that of the National Merit Scholarship Corporation program, which uses both test scores and geographic location to identify eligible students. In the first year of the NHSAP (1983–84), students who had taken the PSAT/NMSQT in 1982–83 as juniors and had identified themselves as Hispanic, and who were United States citizens enrolled in school full-time and would graduate from high school in 1984, were eligible. Approximately 5 percent of this pool of Hispanic PSAT/NMSQT-takers were identified as candidates to participate in the NHSAP. These 1,479 eligible candidates included the two highest scorers on the basis of combined verbal and mathematical scores in each state and the top 700 national scorers; the remainder were selected on a regional basis in proportion to the Hispanic test-taking population in that area.

Letters were sent to high school guidance counselors to be forwarded to the 1,479 students identified as National Hispanic Program Candidates, inviting them to apply. The 1,100 who affirmed their candidacy were selected as National Hispanic Semifinalists and sent a packet of candidacy materials. Application materials received from 750 students contained additional information on background, academic achievements, extracurricular activities, community service, personal statements, and educational and career aspirations. Letters of recommendation from teachers and guidance counselors were also included in the candidates' files, as were transcripts of grades. Students were also required to take the SAT (approximately 86 percent did so).

A panel consisting of college admissions officers and other educators meet to review each file. Selection criteria include the following:

- Evidence of academic potential
- Evidence of persistence
- Evidence of having taken advantage of opportunities
- Evidence of capacity, achievement
- Personal strengths
- Commitment to society/leadership
- Special skills and/or extracurricular activities
- Cultural awareness
- Jobs held/impact on academic achievement
- Barriers overcome
- Moral outlook; values; character; integrity

The following list gives information about eligible students and shows the distribution of candidates by award category for the first year of the program:*

School year students took PSAT/ NMSQT	1982–83
School year students to enter college	1984–85
Number invited to apply	1,479
Number indicating intent to apply	1,100
Number who applied	750
Scholars	250
Honorable Mentions	250
Nonwinners	250

Following is a summary of the selection process used for the 1983–84 program, with a count of eligible candidates by region: A three-part selection process was used to extract apparently eligible candidates from the file of the Preliminary Scholastic Aptitude Test/National Merit Scholarship Qualifying Test (PSAT/NMSQT) for 1982.

- *Part 1* identified the top-scoring two students in each state, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the Possessions for a total of 110 candidates (106 plus ties).
- *Part 2* identified the top-scoring candidates nationally for a total of 837 candidates (700 plus ties).
- *Part 3* identified the high-scoring candidates on a regional basis in proportion to the number of Hispanic test-takers in each region for a total of 532 candidates (485 plus ties). The regional proportions were determined as follows:

Region (College Board)	*Total Number of Eligible Test-Takers (minus top 110)*	*Proportional Number of Students*
New England	456	8
Middle States	3,906	69
Midwest	2,244	39
South	595	10
Southwest	9,815	174
West	8,140	144
Puerto Rico	2,256	40
Territories, APO, FPO	103	1
Total	27,515	485

---

* *Source:* Educational Testing Service, National Hispanic Scholar Awards Program Office.

APPENDIX C

SURVEY OF NATIONAL HISPANIC SCHOLARS

Sponsored by

The College Board
and
Educational Testing Service

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this survey of National Hispanic Scholars. We are interested in knowing more about students who, like you, have qualified for these awards.

There are four sections in this questionnaire. The first asks about your first year at college; the second about your choice of the college you now attend. The third section is about your participation in the National Hispanic Scholar Awards Program, and the fourth is about your education prior to entering college. The questionnaire should take you no longer than 20 minutes to complete.

Although we ask for your name and address in order to be able to follow your progress later, you may be assured that your responses will be treated as confidential. No responses will be associated with your name, and the data will be reported only in the form of group summaries.

Return your questionnaire in the postage-paid envelope provided.

Thank you for your help.

NATIONAL HISPANIC SCHOLAR AWARDS PROGRAM
Student Questionnaire

I. This section of the questionnaire is about your first year at college

1. What courses are you taking or have you taken this year? (Check all that apply.)

___ 1. Art (history, appreciation) or Archaeology
___ 2. Agriculture
___ 3. Biology
___ 4. Business (accounting, marketing, etc.)
___ 5. Chemistry
___ 6. Computer science
___ 7. Economics
___ 8. Education
___ 9. Engineering
___10. English (composition or literature) or Journalism
___11. Foreign Language
___12. Geology (earth science)
___13. History
___14. Mathematics
___15. Music
___16. Philosophy or Religion
___17. Physics
___18. Political science or Government
___19. Psychology
___20. Sociology or Anthropology
___21. Other (What?) ____

2. Which of the following best describes your grades during this first year of school? (Circle one.)

A Mostly A's

B Mostly A's and B's

C Mostly B's

D Mostly B's and C's

E Mostly C's

F Mostly C's and D's

G Mostly D's

H Mostly F's

I I have not received grades

3. Are you taking or have you taken any of the following courses in college? (Circle one number on each line.)

	Yes	No
a. An English course for students from non-English speaking backgrounds.............................	1	2
b. Reading and writing in your language (if your first language was **NOT** English)..................	1	2
c. Other subjects taught in part in your first language (if you first language was **NOT** English)..........	1	2
d. Courses in the history and culture of your ancestors or their life in the United States.....	1	2

4. How difficult have you found your first year of college compared with what you expected?

A Much more difficult than I expected

B Slightly more difficult than I expected

C About what I expected

D Slightly easier than I expected

E Much easier than I expected

5. Where have you been living during this (1984-85) school year?

A At home with my family

B On campus

C Off campus but not with my family

6. Have any of the following been problems for you in adjusting to your first year of college? (Circle one number on each line.)

	Major Problem	Minor Problem	No Problem
a. Being away from home......................	1	2	3
b. Getting along with roommate(s)............	1	2	3
c. Making friends...........................	1	2	3
d. Getting to know teachers..................	1	2	3
e. Managing my time..........................	1	2	3
f. Getting all my work done..................	1	2	3
g. Taking part in class discussions..........	1	2	3
h. Speaking English with an accent...........	1	2	3
i. Feeling out of place because of my background..........................	1	2	3
j. Gaining teachers' respect.................	1	2	3
k. Other (what?)___________________________	1	2	

7. Have you taken part in any of the following types of activities during your first year at college? (Circle one number on each line.)

	Yes	No
a. Intercollegiate sports	1	2
b. Intramural sports	1	2
c. Recreational athletics	1	2
d. Musical groups	1	2
e. Theater or other arts groups	1	2
f. General or special interest clubs or organizations	1	2
g. Hispanic clubs or organizations	1	2
h. Student government	1	2
i. Journalistic or literary activities (magazines or newspapers)	1	2
j. Community or church groups	1	2
k. Social clubs or organizations; sororities or fraternities	1	2

8. Have you received any academic honors (e.g., dean's list) during your first year of college?

A No

B Yes - If yes, please list.

____

____

9. Which of the following are you most likely to major in? (Circle one.)

A Art (history, appreciation) or Archaeology
B Agriculture
C Biology
D Business (accounting, marketing, etc.)
E Chemistry
F Computer science
G Economics
H Education
I Engineering
J English (composition or literature) or Journalism
K Foreign Language
L Geology (earth science)
M History
N Mathematics
O Music
P Philosophy or Religion
Q Physics
R Political science or Government
S Psychology
T Sociology or Anthropology
U Other (What?) ______________________________

II. This section of the questionnaire is about your applications to college and your choice of a college to attend.

10. In the spaces below, write the names of all of the colleges to which you applied, and circle the letter that tells whether you were accepted or rejected by each. (Circle one letter on each line.)

		Accepted	Rejected
1.	______________________________	A	B
2.	______________________________	A	B
3.	______________________________	A	B
4.	______________________________	A	B
5.	______________________________	A	B
6.	______________________________	A	B
7.	______________________________	A	B
8.	______________________________	A	B
9.	______________________________	A	B
10.	______________________________	A	B

11. Listed below are some reasons why students choose to attend particular colleges. Rate the importance to you of each reason in your decision to attend the college at which you are now enrolled. (Circle one number on each line.)

		Not at all important	Moderately important	Very important
a.	Its academic reputation.............	1	2	3
b.	The areas of study or majors available.......................	1	2	3
c.	Its appearance, setting, physical facilities......................	1	2	3
d.	Its cost............................	1	2	3
e.	Its distance from (or closeness to) my home.........................	1	2	3
f.	The financial aid package I was offered.........................	1	2	3
g.	Friends who were going here.........	1	2	3
h.	Hispanic students on campus.........	1	2	3
i.	People I know who went here.........	1	2	3
j.	Its size............................	1	2	3
k.	Its social atmosphere...............	1	2	3
l.	Sports available....................	1	2	3
m.	Some other reason (What?)		2	3
	______________________________		2	3

12. About how far is the college you attend from your parents' home?

    A Less than 5 miles

    B Between 5 and 24 miles

    C Between 25 and 99 miles

    D Between 100 and 499 miles

    E Between 500 and 999 miles

    F 1000 miles or more

13. Which of the following types of financial aid are you receiving at this college? (Circle one number on each line.)

	Yes	No
Federal Aid		
Pell Grant	1	2
Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grant (SEOG)	1	2
National Direct Student Loan (NDSL)	1	2
College Work-Study Program	1	2
Guaranteed Student Loan (GSL)	1	2
PLUS	1	2
ALAS	1	2
ROTC Scholarship	1	2
Other (What?) ______	1	
State Aid		
Need-based grant	1	2
Non-need based grant or scholarship	1	2
On-campus employment	1	2
Loan	1	2
Other (What?) ______	1	
Aid from Other Sources		
Grants or Scholarship Awards (including National Hispanic Scholar Award)	1	2
Loans	1	2
Other (What?) ______	1	

14. How much money will you owe for your education at the end of this (1984-85) school year?

    A None

    B Less than $500

    C Between $500 and $999

    D Between $1,000 and $1,999

    E Between $2,000 and $2,999

    F Between $3,000 and $3,999

    G Between $4,000 and $4,999

    H $5,000 or more

If you did not win a cash award of $1,500 skip to Question 17.

15. How was your award from the National Hispanic Scholar Awards Program used by your college? (Check all that apply.)

____1. I don't know

____2. To replace other grants

____3. To lessen loan burden

____4. As a supplement to other grants and loans

____5. Some other way (What?) ____

16. How will you replace the funds next year? (Check all that apply.)

____1. From my savings

____2. With a loan

____3. With earnings from a job

____4. With money supplied by my family

____5. With increased financial aid from school

____6. I don't know

III. This section of the questionnaire is about your participation in the National Hispanic Scholar Awards Program

---

17. How did you first learn about the National Hispanic Scholar Awards program? (Circle one.)

A In a letter inviting me to apply

B From a counselor or teacher at school

C From friends

D Some other way (What was it?)__________________________________

____

18. Do you feel that your designation as a National Hispanic Scholar benefited you in any of the following ways? (Circle one number on each line.)

	Yes	No
a. Helped me to get into college......................	1	2
b. Helped me to get into a good college................	1	2
c. Increased my desire to go to college................	1	2
d. Encouraged me to apply to more difficult colleges...	1	2
e. Increased my chances for scholarships apart from the Hispanic Scholar Award.................	1	2
f. Increased my self-confidence........................	1	2
g. Some other way (What?) ______________________	1	

19. Would you recommend that other students like yourself apply for the National Hispanic Award if invited?

A Yes

B No

Why? ____

____

IV. This section of the questionnaire is about you, your family, and some of your educational experiences.

20. Were you and your parents born in the United States? (Circle one number on each line.)

	Yes	No
a. You....................................	1	2
b. Your father............................	1	2
c. Your mother............................	1	2

21. What are the occupations of your father or male guardian and your mother or female guardian? (Circle one letter in each column.)

	Father's Occupation	Mother's Occupation
Professional, manager, or owner................	A	A
Skilled, clerical, or sales worker............	B	B
Service or unskilled worker....................	C	C
Farmer or homemaker............................	D	D
Unemployed.....................................	E	E
Retired..	F	F

22. What is the highest level of education completed by your father or male guardian and your mother or female guardian? (Circle one letter in each column.)

	Father	Mother
Grade school...................................	A	A
Some high school...............................	B	B
High school diploma or equivalent..............	C	C
Business or trade school.......................	D	D
Some college...................................	E	E
Associate degree...............................	F	F
Bachelor's degree..............................	G	G
Some graduate or professional school...........	H	H
Graduate or professional degree................	I	I

23. What was the approximate income of your family before taxes last year? Include taxable and nontaxable income from all sources.

A Less than $10,000

B Between $10,000 - $24,999

C Between $25,000 - $49,999

D Between $50,000 - $74,999

E $75,000 or over

24. How many people are dependent on your family's income for financial support? Be sure to include yourself and your parents if applicable.

A Two
B Three
C Four
D Five
E Six
F Seven
G Eight
H Nine or more

25. What was the first language you spoke as a child? (Circle one.)

A English
B Spanish
C Both English and Spanish
D Other (What?) ________________

26. What language did you speak among your friends in high school? (Circle one.)

A English
B Spanish
C Both English and Spanish
D Other (What?) ________________

27. What language do the people in your parents' home usually speak? (Circle one.)

A English
B Spanish
C Both English and Spanish
D Other (What?) ________________

28. How well do you do each of the following? (Circle one number on each line.)

	Extremely well	Well	Moderately well	Not very well	Not at all
a. Understand English when people speak it...........	1	2	3	4	5
b. Speak English............	1	2	3	4	5
c. Read English.............	1	2	3	4	5
d. Write English............	1	2	3	4	5

29. How well do you do each of the following? (Circle one number on each line.)

	Extremely well	Well	Moderately well	Not very well	Not at all
a. Understand Spanish when people speak it..........	1	2	3	4	5
b. Speak Spanish............	1	2	3	4	5
c. Read Spanish.............	1	2	3	4	5
d. Write Spanish............	1	2	3	4	5

30. Did you ever attend school outside of the mainland or continental United States?

A Yes
B No

If **yes**, circle all of the grades during which you attended school outside of the mainland or continental United States, and write where you attended school.

GRADE	WHERE ATTENDED (City and Country)
Preschool.............	____________
Kindergarten..........	____________
1	____________
2	____________
3	____________
4	____________
5	____________
6	____________
7	____________
8	____________
9	____________
10	____________
11	____________
12	____________

31. What was the predominant language of the school(s) you attended outside of the mainland or continental United States? (Circle one.)

A English
B Spanish
C Other (What was it?) ____________

32. While you were in high school, did you take part in any of the following programs or activities? (Circle one number on each line.)

		Yes	No
a.	Cooperative Education/Internship Program (Coop Program)	1	2
b.	Work Study Program	1	2
c.	Talent Search	1	2
d.	Upward Bound	1	2
e.	A Better Chance	1	2
f.	ASPIRA	1	2
g.	A special high school (e.g., science high school, arts high school)	1	2
h.	Special preparation for the SAT or ACT	1	2
i.	Special preparation for achievement tests	1	2
j.	Advanced, AP or honors program in English	1	2
k.	Advanced, AP or honors program in Mathematics	1	2
l.	Advanced, AP or honors program in Science	1	2
m.	Advanced, AP or honors program in another subject	1	2
n.	Bilingual or bicultural program	1	2
o.	Some other program not mentioned above	1	

(What was it?)____________________________________

33. When you were in high school did you have any of the following courses? (Circle one number on each line.)

		Yes	No
a.	An English course for students from non-English speaking backgrounds	1	2
b.	Reading and writing in your first language (if your first language was **NOT** English)	1	2
c.	Other subjects taught in part in your first language (if you first language was **NOT** English)	1	2
d.	Courses in the history and culture of your ancestors or their life in the United States	1	2

34. What was the proportion of Hispanic students in your high school? (Circle one.)

A Less than 10 percent

B 10 - 19 percent

C 20 - 29 percent

D 30 - 39 percent

E 40 - 49 percent

F 50 percent or more

35. How many of your high school teachers were Hispanic?

A None

B One or two

C Three or four

D Five or more

36. Did you ever have a Hispanic guidance counselor?

A Yes
B No

37. Did you receive counseling in any of the following areas while you were in high school? (Circle one number on each line.)

	Yes	No
a. Academic..	1	2
b. Career planning.................................	1	2
c. College selection...............................	1	2
d. Financial Aid...................................	1	2
e. Personal..	1	2
f. Other (What?)________________________	1	

38. If you answered "Yes" to any of the above questions, who provided the counseling? (Circle all that apply.)

1 A guidance counselor

2 A teacher

3 Someone else at school (Who?) ____________________

4 Someone outside of school (Who?)____________________

39a. Was there a particular person who encouraged you in your academic career?

A No
B Yes

b. If yes, who was that person?

A A parent
B A sibling
C Another family member (who?)____________________
D A teacher
E A counselor
F Another person at school (who?)____________________
G A clergyman
H Someone else (who?)____________________

c. Was that person Hispanic?

A Yes
B No

NAME: ______________________________

ADDRESS: ______________________________

____

We would like to have your summer address and telephone number, so that we can contact you later to learn what you will be doing next year.

PHONE NUMBER: (___|___|___) ___|___|___—___|___|___|___
Area code

Best time to call: ________ (a.m. / p.m.)

ADDRESS: ______________________________

____

In case we have difficulty reaching you, we'd also like to have the names of two people who will know where you are if you move.

1. NAME: ______________________________

ADDRESS: ______________________________

____

PHONE NUMBER: (___|___|___) ___|___|___—___|___|___|___
Area code

HOW IS THIS PERSON RELATED TO YOU: ______________________________

SPOUSE'S FULL NAME: ______________________________

2. NAME: ______________________________

ADDRESS: ______________________________

____

PHONE NUMBER: (___|___|___) ___|___|___—___|___|___|___
Area code

HOW IS THIS PERSON RELATED TO YOU: ______________________________

SPOUSE'S FULL NAME: ______________________________

REFERENCES

Arbeiter, S. 1984. *Profiles, college-bound seniors, 1984.* New York: College Entrance Examination Board.

Astin, A. W. 1975. *Preventing students from dropping out.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Astin, A. W. 1982. *Minorities in American higher education.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Astin, H. S., and C. P. Burciaga. 1981. *Chicanos in higher education: Progress and attainment.* Los Angeles: Higher Education Research Institute.

Ballesteros, E. 1986. Do Hispanics receive an equal educational opportunity? The relationship of school outcomes, family background, and high school curriculum. In *Latino college students,* ed. M. A. Olivas, pp. 47–70. New York: Teachers College Press.

Baral, D. P. 1979. Academic achievement of recent immigrants from Mexico. *NABE Journal* 3:1–13.

Baratz-Snowden, J. C., and R. Durán. 1987. *The educational progress of language minority students: Findings from the 1983–84 NAEP Reading Survey.* Report of National Assessment of Educational Progress, Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey.

Berryman, S. E. 1983. *Who will do science? Trends, and their causes in minority and female representation among holders of advanced degrees in science and mathematics.* New York: Rockefeller Foundation.

Blackwell, J. E. 1981. *Mainstreaming outsiders: The production of black professionals.* Bayside, New York: General Hall.

Brown, G. H., N. L. Rosen, S. T. Hill, and M. A. Olivas. 1980. *The condition of education for Hispanic Americans.* Prepared for the National Center for Education Statistics. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Cabrera, Y. A. 1978. *Minorities in higher education: Chicanos and others.* Niwot, Colorado: Sierra Publications.

Carter, T. P., and R. D. Segura. 1979. *Mexican Americans in school: A decade of change.* New York: College Entrance Examination Board.

The Condition of Education. 1980. National Center for Education Statistics. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.

Cooney, R., L. Rogler, L. Correale, and V. Ortiz. 1980. Integenerational change in educational attainment among Puerto Ricans: A closer look at the migration experience. Paper presented at annual conference of Population Association of America, Denver.

de los Santos, Jr., A. G., J. Montemayor, and E. Solís. 1980. *Chicano students in institutions of higher education: Access, attrition, and achievement.* Austin: University of Texas at Austin, Office for Advanced Research in Hispanic Education, College of Education.

Durán, R. P. 1983. *Hispanics' education and background.* New York: College Entrance Examination Board.

Durán, R. P. 1986. Prediction of Hispanics' college achievement. In *Latino college students,* ed. M. A. Olivas, pp. 221–45. New York: Teachers College Press.

Durán, R. P., M. K. Enright, and D. A. Rock. 1985. *Language factors and Hispanic freshmen's student profile.* College Board Report No. 85-3, ETS RR No. 85-44. New York: College Entrance Examination Board.

Fligstein, N., and R. M. Fernández. 1982. *The causes of Hispanic educational attainment, patterns and analyses.* Prepared for the National Commission on Employment Policy. Chicago: National Opinion Research Center.

Ford Foundation. 1984. *Hispanics: Challenges and opportunities.* New York: Ford Foundation.

Gladieux, L. 1975. *Distribution of federal student assistance: The enigma of the two-year colleges.* New York: College Entrance Examination Board.

Hispanic Policy Development Project (HPDP). 1984. *Make something happen: Hispanics and urban high school reform.* Vols. 1 and 2. New York: Hispanic Policy Development Project.

Hodgkinson, H. L. 1985. *All one system: Demographics of education—kindergarten through graduate school.* Washington, D.C.: Institute for Educational Leadership.

Kent, L. 1982. *Puerto Ricans in U.S. higher education: Current status and recent progress.* Los Angeles: Higher Education Research Institute.

Kimball, W. L. 1968. Parent and family influences on academic achievement among Mexican American students. Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Education, University of California, Los Angeles.

Mahard, R. 1978. The influence of high school racial composition on the academic achievement and college attendance of Hispanics. Unpublished paper. Santa Monica, California: Rand Corporation.

Moore, J., and H. Pachón. 1985. *Hispanics in the United States.* Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Munõz, D. G. 1986. Identifying areas of stress for Chicano undergraduates. In *Latino college students,* ed. M. A. Olivas, pp. 131–56. New York: Teachers College Press.

Nelson, S. 1980. *Community colleges and their share of student financial assistance.* New York: College Entrance Examination Board.

Nie, N. H., C. H. Hull, J. G. Jenkins, K. Steinbrenner, and D. E. Bent. 1970. *Statistical package for the social sciences.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Nielsen, F. 1986. Hispanics in high school and beyond. In *Latino college students,* ed. M. A. Olivas, pp. 71–103. New York: Teachers College Press.

Nielsen, F., and R. M. Fernández. 1981. *Hispanic students in American high schools: Background characteristics and achievement.* Contractor Report. Prepared for National Center for Education Statistics under contract OE-300-78-0208. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Noboa-Ríos, A. 1982. An analysis of Hispanic doctoral recipients from U.S. universities (1900–1973) with special emphasis on Puerto Rican doctorates. *Metas* 2(2).

Olivas, M. A. 1986. Financial aid for Hispanics: Access, ideology, and packaging policies. In *Latino college students,* ed. M. A. Olivas, pp. 281–95. New York: Teachers College Press.

Orfield, G. 1981. *Desegregation of black and Hispanic students from 1968 to 1980.* Washington, D.C.: Joint Center for Political Studies.

Orfield, G. 1987. *School Segregation in the 1980s: Trends in the states and metropolitan areas.* Report by National School Desegregation Project to Joint Center for Political Studies. Chicago: University of Chicago, Office of News and Information.

Ortiz, V. 1986. Generational status, family background, and educational attainment among Hispanic youth and non-Hispanic white youth. In *Latino college students,* ed. M. A. Olivas, pp. 29–46. New York: Teachers College Press.

Orum, L. S. 1986. *The education of Hispanics: Status and implications.* Washington D.C.: National Council of La Raza.

Payán, R. M., R. E. Peterson, and N. A. Castille. 1984. *Access to college for Mexican Americans in the Southwest: Replication after 10 years.* College Board Report No. 84-3, ETS RR No. 84-17. New York: College Entrance Examination Board.

Pearson, W., Jr. 1984. *Black scientists, white society, and colorless science: A study of universalism in American science.* Port Washington, New York: Associated Faculty Press.

Peñalosa, F., and E. McDonagh. 1966. Social mobility in a Mexican-American community. *Social Forces* 44:498–505.

Ramírez, A. 1981. Language attitudes and the speech of Spanish-English bilingual pupils. In *Latino language and communicative behavior,* ed. R. P. Durán, pp. 212–32. Norwood, New Jersey: Ablex.

Rosenbaum, J. E. 1976. *Making inequality: The hidden curriculum of high school tracking.* New York: Wiley.

Ryan, E., and M. A. Carranza. 1975. Evaluative reactions of adolescents toward speakers of standard English and Mexican American accented English. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 31(5): 855–63.

Santos, R. 1986. Hispanic high school graduates: Making choices. In *Latino college students,* ed. M. A. Olivas, pp. 104–27. New York: Teachers College Press.

So, A. Y. 1984. The financing of college education by Hispanic parents. *Urban Education* 19(2): 145–60.

U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. 1973. *Teachers and students: Differences in teacher interaction with Mexican American and Anglo students.* Report 5: Mexican American Education Study. Report of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Washington, D.C.

Verdugo, R. R. 1986. Educational stratification and Hispanics. In *Latino college students,* ed. M. A. Olivas, pp. 325–47. New York: Teachers College Press.

Wagner, A., and L. Rice. 1977. Student financial aid: Institutional packaging and family expenditure patterns. College Entrance Examination Board. Mimeo.

Wilson, R., and S. E. Meléndez. 1985. *Minorities in higher education.* Fourth Annual Status Report. ACE Annual Meeting, Miami, Florida. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.